

RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES AND
THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW
POETICAL TRADITION IN
SINHALESE, 1852 - 1906.

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor
of Philosophy at the University of London.

1973

TISSA KARIYAWASAM



ProQuest Number: 10673247

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10673247

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

ABSTRACT

The period from 1852 to 1906 in Ceylon is, though comparatively recent, a period which has been misinterpreted and treated without a proper consultation of the existing materials. After the British conquest, during this period we find the employment of modern techniques in the field of literature by the Christian missionaries, and the adoption of the same methods by the Sinhalese Buddhists to combat Christian writings and to propagate Buddhism.

This adoption of facilities like the printing and selling of books paved the way and the interest for the evolvement and the development of a new poetical tradition in Sinhalese which I have discussed in these pages.

A few devoted scholars of the period encouraged learning and they have developed the traditional knowledge. When the Theosophists arrived in Ceylon on the pretext of safeguarding Buddhism, the activities of the Buddhist Theosophical Society created a new lay leadership in society who were ready to accept responsibilities in the country while lessening the place enjoyed by the bhikkhus in religious and social

affairs. With the advent of this new group of leaders through the Young Men's Buddhist Association and the Buddhist National Congress, the religious zeal of the earlier priest leaders subsided and a group of new writers who were not recognised by the traditional scholars pursued the literary career they had already started with the printing presses which emerged through the religious struggle. These poets and their creations were the forerunners of the new poetical tradition which came into being after the death of old Sinhalese poetry in the first quarter of the nineteenth century.

Materials for this study are drawn mostly from Sinhalese documents hitherto unexplored by Sinhalese writers, Wesleyan Missionary records, the collections of the British Museum, Royal Commonwealth Society library, and the Public Record Office in London, Śrī Pragñāsēkhara Library, Navagamuva, Ceylon, and other personal collections in Ceylon. The accounts we come across of the activities of the Theosophists and their followers were written in English but the reality behind those documents can only be assessed with the assistance of the documents in Sinhalese, the language of all the participants of these religious activities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study has been made possible by the leave of absence and the financial assistance extended to me by the Vidyodaya University, Gangodavila, Nugegoda, Ceylon. I am grateful to the University authorities for allowing this opportunity to me.

At the outset my sincerest and heartfelt thanks are due to Mr. C.H.B.Reynolds, my supervisor of this study who constantly advised me and went through my work with utmost interest from the beginning to the end.

In collecting materials available in Ceylon which I could not gather before my departure from the Island, I have received the invaluable assistance of Mr.Dhanapala Balage, Development officer, Bulatsinhala, who gave up his time to meet people and to collect materials from personal collections.

I have to record my sincere thanks to the librarians and the staffs of the School of Oriental and African Studies, Senate House Library, Public Record Office, Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society, Royal Commonwealth Society, British Museum and to Mr. D.L.D.Samarasekara of the Ceylon High Commission, and all those whom I have mentioned in the bibliography for allowing me access to

their carefully guarded personal libraries, and to my friends who had given introductions for me to reach those places and those scholars in Ceylon.

Finally I have to mention here the indescribable patience and understanding shown by my wife, Sita Padmini, during the period I engaged in this work.

ABBREVIATIONS

B.N.C	-Buddhist National Congress.
B.T.S	-The Buddhist Theosophical Society.
M.B.S	-The Maha-Bodhi Society.
M.M.S	-The Methodist Missionary Society.
O.D.L	-Old Diary Leaves.
Y.M.B.A	-The Young Men's Buddhist Association

CONTENTS

1. Chapter One	1-87
2. Chapter Two	88-179
3. Chapter Three	180-258
4. Chapter Four	259-344
5. Chapter Five	345-422
6. Chapter Six	423-501
7. Conclusion	502-507
8. Bibliography	508-529

Chapter one

RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES OF THE CLERGY

According to the traditional view, the king was the supreme sovereign over the religious as well as social affairs of the country. When capitulation to the British occurred in the kingdom of Kandy, in 1815, the priests of the Siamese sect and the Amarapura sect faced a serious problem in regard to the place occupied by the king in religion. The fifth clause of the Kandyan Convention substituted the British monarchy in the place of the king, and subsequently all the bhikkhus in Ceylon believed the king of England to be their religious and social leader; but this created a hostile attitude among the Christians.

Due to the pressure exerted by the Christian missionaries not only over the colonial governor in the Island but also at the office of the Colonial Secretary in London, who did not realise the actual implications of this acceptance,¹ the British government acted stupidly and carelessly. This resulted in the proclamation made by Sir Collin Campbell on 23.4.1845,

1.C.O 54- 209, Stanley to Campbell, Despatch No.76 of 15.9.1843,
C.O 54- 210, Stanley to Campbell, Despatch No.210 of 24 July 1844.

at a meeting held at Kandy with the Malvatta and Asgiriya chapters and the up-country chiefs, where he announced the withdrawal of all interference in the Buddhist religion and the cessation of the appointment of priests by Her Majesty's government.²

This unexpected declaration aroused the sentimental feelings of the bhikkhus and with the assistance of the loyal Buddhists they submitted petitions and appealed for 'protection and patronage for Buddhism'.³ This dilemma did not receive a solution for some years. Buddhists believed that according to the Convention the British government was the protector of their religion, and the people of Dumbara went in a procession to the government agent in Kandy on 6.7.1848 to appeal on this matter.⁴ But meanwhile the Christian missionaries interpreted this procession as part of an attempt to overthrow the British government by the Kandyan priests.⁵

But this problem invited the serious attention of the government when fifty priests of the Asgiriya chapter, including the chief priest of Dambulla Raja Mahā Vihāraya,

2.C.O.54-229, Torrington to Grey, Despatch No.133 and No.134 of 14.10.1847.

3.C.O.54-223 (Vol.1), No.1-49, (January- February 1846), 1941 Buddhists to Queen Victoria, written on 7.1.1846 at Kandy.

4.C.O.54-251, Vol.7, Enclosure No.4 of Despatch No.126 of 9.7.1848..

5.C.O.54-249, Vol.5, (June-July 1848), Despatch No.126 of 6.7.1848.

in a petition addressed to the agent of Kandy requested him to fill the vacancies of anunāyaka and nāyaka theeras which would enable them to hold their religious rites, and the governor, ignoring the vehement criticisms of the Christians, agreed to act along the lines of the traditional king in religious appointments.

Thus from 1852 the Siamese sect received the approval of the governor in their religious functions. There were two chapters of the Siamese sect, namely Malvatta and Asgiriya, with two mahanāyakas. They performed their upasampadā ceremonies separately, and temples belonged to one or other of the two chapters. Most wealthy and landowning temples belong to one of the two sides. The twenty bhikkhus elected to represent these wealthy temples formed the executive committee (vimsat vārgika kāraka sabhā). This committee was limited to the up-country bhikkhus and they were also the leaders of the low-country. They appointed nāyakas for Halāvata, Koloṃba navakōralē, and Mātara Hambantara. For their activities these three were responsible to the executive committee in Kandy, although they were not included in the committee.

Bentara Vanavāsa Vihāraya, famous seat of learning in the Southern part of the Island, had much influence on the course of religious activities during the period

under discussion. The chief incumbent of the temple, Bentara Atthadassi(-1862), was for a long time disappointed in the disunity exhibited by the bhikkhus of the Siamese sect, who divided themselves into two. Besides that, he was the most brilliant scholar of the day, and independently illustrated his views on some problems which existed in the community of bhikkhus.

His curiosity on these problems allowed him to write a long and a carefully detailed letter to Vanaratana, Sangharāja of Siam,⁶ in which he discussed his contentions. This letter written in 1845, bears evidence to his scholarship, his energy and his opposition to the prevailing deterioration in the Siamese sect, of which he was a member.

One of his contentions was on the theory of Adhimāsa. After a period of four years, when the leap year occurs with fiftythree pōya days in the calendar and a adhi-Āsala month, a month with five pōyas, not four as in other months, it manifests an influence on the day of observing vas. The traditional ecclesiastical law allows the bhikkhus to observe the rainy season(vas) on the first day after Āsala Fullmoon day (Āsala pālaviya dā).

6. A hand-written copy of this letter lies at Vanavāsa Vihāraya at Bentara, and it is reproduced in A.P. Buddhaddatta's 'Pāli Sandesāvalī', (1962), pp. 70-85.

When adhi-Āsala month occurs bhikkhus perform the observance on the first day after the second pōya. The Malvatta chapter instructed the bhikkhus to observe the adhi-Āsala month in the year 1840, but Bentara Atthadassi after his calculations, appealed to the low-country bhikkhus to observe it in 1839. This was the birth of the Adhimāsa Controversy, prolonged for twentyfour years, even after his death.

Atthadassi was a student of astrology and his ability along those lines paved the way for another controversy on candra māsa and sūriya māsa. As the sun came into being before the moon he argued that calculations in astrology should be done in the same way, first the Solar month and secondly the Lunar month. This is a more profound and practical system in Ceylonese astrology and is still followed by astrologers.⁷ This theory on the importance of the sun shows his independent way of thinking, since the moon moves in between the

7. According to the astrological methods prevailing in Ceylon up to the present day, in every aspect, they take the Sun as their first consideration, and cast the first Raviya or the Lagnaya of the Sun as Mēsa Rāsiya and the last Raviya as Mīna Rāsiya. The famous astrologers of the Southern part of the country when casting the horoscopes of a newly born child prepare two lagnas called Jamma Lagnaya and Candra Lagnaya. In some areas the latter is called Navāmsakaya. When one wants to read the horoscope one takes the Jamma Lagnaya for his forecast but not the Candra Lagnaya.

Mēṣa Rāśiya and Mīna Rāśiya and it changes its place in between two Ravis, thereby creating a difference in the calculations by the Moon and by the Sun.⁸

In his third theory on alms (sāṅghika dāna vādaya), which was not so popular, he criticised the ways of accepting alms from laymen. The fourth theory of Bentara Atthadassi was of considerable importance. Bhikkhus who once received the higher ordination at one and the same upōsathāghara were now divided into two chapters and they performed their religious observances separately in two upōsathāgharas at Malvatta and Asgiriya. He disapproved of this separation and advocated the unity of the Siamese sect to perform duties in one upōsathāghara.

The higher ordination performed in these two places had caused doubts in the minds of some bhikkhus on the purity of their upasampadā. As the country was now

8. April 13 th is considered as the date of the birth of the Sun and from that day the astrologers start their calculations. 14 April 1971 is the first bhāga or day of Mēṣa Rāśiya, which is the month of the Sun. If one considers the Moon it is the 14 th day or tithiya of the Candira Māsa. Mēṣa Rāśiya ends on 14.5.1971, which is the fourth tithiya or day of Ava Paksaya in the lunar month (Vesak Jalavaka). It is the 31 st day or bhāga of the Sūriya Māsa, and this clearly shows the difference of twenty-seven days in the calculations.

See Āpā Pancāṅga Lita, compiled by Tissa Āpā Seneviratna, 117 th issue, (1971-1972).

A discussion with Rev. Kāmburupitiye Vanaratana nāyaka thera enlightened me on this point.

without legal and spiritual leaders, realising the inadequacy of the mahānāyakas and the executive Council on the affair he appealed to the Sangharāja of Siam to send ten bhikkhus from Siam to unite and to advise the bhikkhus of the Siamese sect.

This detailed letter helps us to form an idea about the first signs of deterioration among the bhikkhus of the Siamese sect, and his sole intention in writing this long letter was to bring about unity among the bhikkhus. Earlier in the 1830 s, he had put these ideas into ink in a letter, but the letter before being sent to Siam was torn into pieces by the mahānāyaka of Malvatta. Without considering the proper procedure for sending a letter through the Malvatta mahānāyaka, in 1846 Bentara Atthadassi sent this letter privately and the mahānāyaka received the information later. The mahānāyakas of both chapters, who always treated the low-country bhikkhus in a contemptuous manner, wrote to the Sangharāja of Siam in 1847, saying that this letter sent by a low-country bhikkhu who lived near the sea of his ignorance must not be taken seriously.⁹

This opprobrious act never brought the expected results to the up-country mahānāyakas. The motion of

9. 'hetṭhā raṭṭhavāsī mahā samuddāsanne bhikkhunā ajānitvā katam'.

Atthadassi was backed by some other oppressed bhikkhus of the low-country, who were dissatisfied with the rigid principles of the mahānāyakas and their derogatory attitude towards the low-country bhikkhus. Maligaspē Dharmakīrti Śrī Mangala and Valānē Siddhattha were infuriated by the reaction of the mahānāyakas. Among the bhikkhus of the low-country the attitude of Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala was quite a different one, and on 25.4.1850 he wrote a letter to Malvatta criticising the views of Atthadassi on Adhimāsa, offered himself as a supporter for Malvatta at any time and was prepared to have a discussion with Atthadassi in front of the mahānāyakas at Kandy.¹⁰

The high priests of the low-country, seeing the dangers of the situation when teachers and students fall apart and a bhikkhu in his second year argues with nāyaka theras, attempted to unite Malvatta and Bentara. For a period of four years long discussions were held. Descriptive despatches were sent. Correspondence was exchanged from Malvatta to Bentara and from Bentara to Malvatta. These writings brought no fruits and the high priests of the low-country advised Atthadassi to go to Kandy.

10. Y. Paññānanda, Śrī Sumangala Caritaya, (1947), Vol. ii, pp. 414-417.

At last, to take part in the higher ordination ceremony of 1855, Bentara Atthadassi with other nāyaka theras of the low-country and fifteen sāmaneras under his guidance were taken to Kandy. In a letter he expressed his intention to Malvatta that 'without prolonging this calamity he wanted to unite with the mahānāyakas of Malvatta and Asgiriya and to forget the past'. He with others left Bentara on 27.5.1855.

Things took an unexpected shape, however. It was not a hearty welcome for Bentara. There was no intention of a peaceful discussion. He saw his opponent Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala with Baṭuvantudāvē Pandit at the residence of the mahānāyaka. Without offering him a hand of reconciliation and peace, the mahānāyakas had arranged for a debate between Bentara and Hikkaḍuvē on Adhimāsaya. This is a debate which Bentara and the other high priests had never dreamt of. At the end of the debate the mahānāyaka of Malvatta issued a proclamation that 'after a debate at Malvatta between Atthadassi and Sumangala we accept our view on Adhimāsa as correct while Bentara's theory is discarded, and in the future all bhikkhus of the Siamese sect must follow the ideas of Malvatta'.¹¹

11. Y.Paññānanda, op.cit, p.416.

After this incident Bentara completely changed his views on unity. When the higher ordination ceremony started he asked for the committee to include bhikkhus from the low-country. This was not allowed and the Vimsat Vārgika Kāraka Sabhāva performed its duties on the fifteen novices of Bentara. But though they received higher ordination nobody seemed to be satisfied with the procedure.

A meeting was held at Kōṭṭē Rajamahā Vihāraya in the month of June, 1855 and the participants decided to hold a higher ordination ceremony in the low-country. Those who took part in the meetings were Bentara Atthadassi mahāsthavira, Maligaspē Dharmakīrti Śrī Mangala nāyakasthavira, Pānadurē Sumangala mahāsthavira of Maha Aruggoda Indasārārāmaya, Pāpiliyānē Sīlavamsa nāyakasthavira of Galgoda Śrī Mahāvihāraya, Valānē Siddhattha mahāsthavira of Ratmalāna. And at a later gathering of the bhikkhus they formed themselves into 'Śrī Kalyāṇi Sāmagrī Dharma Mahā Sangha Sabhā' and resolved to hold the ceremony at the Kālani river in 1856. Accommodation for the bhikkhus was arranged under the instructions of Mangala nāyaka thera. Maligaspē nāyaka thera meanwhile sought permission from Malvatta for the higher ordination ceremony as it 'will

train the low-country bhikkhus in the observances'.¹²

Not only the bhikkhus of the low-country, but the general Buddhist public also was interested in this activity, as they also felt that they were under some pressure from the up-country in their activities. Buddhists of the low-country had to travel a long way to Kandy to witness their temple novice receiving his higher ordination. Mullēriyāvē liyana mahattayā offered the land for the ceremony.¹³

Maligaspē nāyaka thera was intelligent. He very patiently but in an insisting tone wrote to the mahānāyaka of Malvatta inviting five sthaviras of the Committee, including the two mahānāyakas, for the higher ordination ceremony. His second letter written on 5.2.1856 was not accorded any answer for three months. This silence shows their ignorance in the matter and their misguided policy after receiving a letter from Hikkāduvē Sumangala. Sumangala not only informed the mahānāyaka of this activity but ^{also} suggested that 'with the assistance of a solicitor the mahānāyakas must submit a petition to the governor, as it is against the traditional codes of the

12. I am grateful to Labugama Lankānanda nāyaka thera for the information.

13. Now this place is known as Nelligasvattē Kalyāṇivamsikā-rāmaya.

bhikkhus and the British government'.¹⁴ These letters may have misguided the clear vision of the mahānāyakas. At last after four months, on 12.5.1856 the mahānāyakas of Malvatta and Asgiriya, with the Committee, turned down the invitation for five bhikkhus for the upasampadā ceremony. But the belated reply could not prevent the ceremony.

It took place on 22.5.1856. For the first time a higher ordination ceremony of the Siamese sect was performed at the Kālani river, giving upasampadā to twentyone bhikkhus. At the ceremony Bentara Atthadassi performed the duties of ganācariya, while Maligaspē nāyaka thera was upādhyāya, and Pānadurē Sumangala, Pāpiliyānē Sīlavamsa, Valānē Siddhattha, Uḍugampola Ratanapāla, Baddēgama Saranankara, Talangama Sumangala, Kataluvē Atthadassi and Boralāsgamuvē Piyadassi acted as Kammācariyas.¹⁵

Now we see the Siamese sect divided into two in 1856. Siyam Nikāya of Kālaniya, by its inauguration, not only acted as a new force but convinced the bhikkhus of the low-country of the inefficiency of the Malvatta mahānāyaka. There were many attempts to prevent the

14. Letter written by Sumangala to Malvatta, reproduced in Y. Paññānanda, op.cit, Vol.1, pp.63-64.

15. Kalukoṇḍayāvē nāyaka thera, the present nāyaka of the sect, supplied me with some information.

upasampadā ceremony at Kālāṇiya. When the attempts failed the opponents never stopped their activities.¹⁶ Sapugoda nāyaka thera of the Galapāta Vihāraya, Bentota, Valagedara Dhammadassi and Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala were very active in correspondence, with Malvatta imposing 'non-participation' in religious duties with the dissentients.¹⁷ Pamphlets of an abusive nature towards the Malvatta were distributed and Hikkaḍuvē got ready to prepare a reply for the mahānāyakas. Malvatta appointed Vāḍḍuvē Dhammānanda of Gorakāne temple as the nāyaka thera of the low-country dissociates with the ceremony. 'Non- participation' in religion was declared.¹⁸ However these activities could not prevent the disunity and disruption of the Siamese sect.

After thirteen years, on 24.4.1869 Vāḍḍuvē Dhammānanda of Kandē Vihāraya, Gorakāna in a letter expressed to the mahānāyaka of Malvatta fears of the disintegration of the sect, appealing for a reconciliation with the Kālāṇi Nikāya. Mahānāyaka Mādagama Dhammarakkhita then declared the earlier instruction on 'non-participation' in religious affairs nullified and that in the future all bhikkhus should get together peacefully, forgetting the past.

16.Y.Faññānanda, op.cit, Vol.i, pp.70-71.

17.A letter by Malvatte mahānāyaka to the priests, now lying at Pravacanodaya Pirivena, Molligoda.

18.Letter to Dhammānanda by Devamitta Dhammarakkhita mahānāyaka thera on 24.4.1896.

According to the new declaration the Kālani sect too changed its ' non-alliance ' policy, after the death of its founders. 'When they received an invitation it was agreed to join in the activities of Malvatta'.¹⁹

Though it seems that both parties reached a superficial unity in this way, from the formation of Kālani sect in 1856 until 1869 there were substantial factors to create an unbridgeable gap between Kandyan mahānāyakas and Bentara. The Adhimāsa theory of Atthadassi, which we have discussed earlier, invited the serious attention of both sides after 1856. The bhikkhus of the Kālani sect observed the vas season on a different date in that year, against the declaration of Malvatta. This came to the limelight and invited the attention of the general Buddhist public in 1859, when the low-country bhikkhus of the Kālani sect followed the same. The ordinary Buddhists saw that the bhikkhus of the low-country observed the rainy season on two different days.²⁰ Sumangala sought advice from Siam on this matter.²¹ Rumours were spreading in the low-country that if Malvatta was ready to accept the view of Bentara on the Adhimāsa

19. 'Kalyāṇi Sāmagrī Sangha Sabhāva Pilibaṇḍa Sammata Pota'.

20. Y. Paṇṇānanda, op.cit, Vol.ii, p.417.

21. ibid, p.418.

Controversy the founders would suspend the new ordination ceremony at Kālaṇiya. Baddēgama Sumangala and Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala strongly urged the Malvatta not to accept the theory of Bentara.

Through Maligaspē nāyaka thera, Bentara submitted his contention on the theory of Adhimāsa to Malvatta. Without discussing this question the mahānāyakas of Malvatta and Asgiriya sent him a letter with twenty questions. Bentara Atthadassi after reading the questionnaire published a long and interesting reply to the general public on 4.11.1857. When one carefully reads the reply one will gather that there were further reasons for the disunity between Malvatta and Bentara.

Replying to question number fourteen Bentara said; 'when someone says something with gratitude to his religion he must not be discarded as a fool(mōgha)'. Question number nineteen infuriated Bentara and in his reply he exposed a mean deed the mahānāyaka had engaged in. The question was ironically asked 'whether in the low-country there exists any Sangharāja cleverer than the mahānāyakas of Kandy'.²² Bentara replied ' there is no Sangharāja

22. 'Vāliṇiṭṭa Saranankara Sangharāja mahāsthavira pādayan vahansēgē paṭan Galgiriyaṇvē Dhammarakkhita Sumangala nāyaka sthavirayan vahansē dakvā mē atarē vāda siṭiya sthavirayan vahansēlāṭa vādā samartha Sangharāja kenek mehe siṭinavāda'.

Y.Paññānanda, op.cit, Vol.ii, p.432.

in the low-country. But before Vatupola was appointed to the anunāyakaship, Turnour, the government agent, had invited Bentara Atthadassi to fill the vacancy, through the agent at Galle. If he had been allowed to come to Kandy on that day without hindrance he would by now have been appointed to the mahānāyakaship you now enjoy'.²³ These allegations were known to the Sinhalese Buddhists of the low-country and created an impact on the authoritative position of the mahānāyakas of Kandy.

During the lifetime of Bentara Atthadassi mahāsthavira, he never thought to bother himself about the writings of Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala against his theory. After the death of Atthadassi, Sumangala made attempts to establish his theory throughout the Island. At a discussion held at Kōṭṭē Raja Mahā Vihāraya, Sumangala challenged a pupil scholar of Atthadassi to prove his teacher's theory on Adhimāsa. Subsequently a meeting was arranged at the same place from January first, 1864.²⁴ Yātrāmullē Dharmārāma asked the questions and Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala answered. This was a very scholarly discussion on astrology and the rules of observing vas.

The second session of the controversy was held at Galapāta Vihāraya, Bentota, on 25.2.1864. To the queries

23.Y.Paññānanda, op.cit, Vol.ii, p.441.

24.OR 2258.

of Hikkaḍuvē, this time Yātrāmullē replied. At the final stage the authority quoted by Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala, Vinayāḷankārāya, came under heavy criticism from Yātrāmullē and true to his pupilship of Bentara, he illustrated the misinterpretations and absurdities of the author of Vinayāḷankārāya, and invited intelligent monks to review the situation.

Although the debate continued in a sophisticated and very disciplined manner, the rivalry in the minds of the leaders is evident in the correspondence of Yātrāmullē Dharmārāma, who wrote to Professor Childers that Sumangala is a traitor at heart.²⁵ This type of concealed enmity would have soured all the good course of religion.

While the controversy on Adhimāsa separated the Siamese sect from that of Kālaṇiṇya, the Controversy on robes (Pārupana Vādaya) disintegrated the unity inside the Siamese sect. At that time bhikkhus of the Siamese sect covered the left shoulder while the Rāmañña and Amarapura bhikkhus covered both. On 27.7.1884 Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala sent invitations to Baddēgama Saranankara of Pāṃankāḍa Vihārāya, the mahānāyaka of the Amarapura sect,

25. 'Sipkaḍuvē Sumangala terunvahansē saha Baṭuvantudāvē gurunnānsē mahatmayāt apē ācāryayan vahansēṭa saha apaṭat viruddhava vāda karana apē amitrayō bava Lankāvē buddhāgamkāra siyaludenā atarēma prakāṭayi'. Letter written on 4.4.1870 by Y. Dharmārāma to R.C. Childers.
OR 2258.

Vāligama Sumangala of Pulinatalārāmaya, and Vaskaḍuvē Subhūti, of the Amarapura sect to attend a discussion which would be held at Pāmankaḍa Vihāraya, on Sunday, March second at two o'clock to discuss a very important matter to the Buddhists. He professed the correctness of covering both shoulders at the meeting and he started to do so. Some bhikkhus of the Siamese sect had promised to cover both shoulders but they deserted him in no time. Sumangala being the high priest of Adam's Peak and Galle District, and the principal of Vidyōdaya Pirivena, nobody could have opposed his view in public. But his attitude was criticised by all the bhikkhus of the sect. The high priest of the Siamese sect accused him of allowing the identity of the Siamese sect and the Govigama caste to be lost by covering both shoulders, and he was alleged to be a mere imitator of the Amarapura and Rāmañña sect. ²⁶

This time also Sumangala's theory on robes was met by a leading Buddhist and oriental scholar, principal of Vidyālankāra Pirivena, and his own colleague at Ratmalāna, Ratmalānē Dhammālōka. The whole controversy rested on the interpretation of the phrase and the ecclesiastical rule ' parimaṇḍalam pārupitabbam ubhō

26. Letter dated 28.3.1886 of Talāhēnē Amaramoli to Sumangala reproduced in Y. Paññānanda, op.cit, Vol.ii, pp.569-570.

kaṇṇē samam katvā'. At Kālāṇi Vihāraya an immense gathering of bhikkhus was held. Both parties were very powerful.²⁷

The debate was conducted orally and the report of the queries and answers were submitted to the mahānāyakas and the Committee, inviting a decision on the controversy before 15.10.1884 and saying that both sides were ready to accept the authority. At one stage Ratmalānē Dhammāloka questioned Sumangala like this; 'Is there not any difference in the wearing of robes between the Burmese sect and the Siamese sect?'. Then Sumangala accepted the difference. And when he was cross examined he felt obliged to accept that the rule 'Parimandalam ... samam katvā' is meant to indicate a covering of one shoulder. Thus the foundation of the controversy was shattered by Dhammāloka.

Then at the second session held on 29.9.1884 at Kālāniya on Hikkāduvē's queries Dhammāloka answered again. Once he cited from Pali texts to show that even Lord Buddha when searching for alms and when preaching covered only one shoulder. (mēghavaṇṇam pansukūlam

27. There were 8 scholars each to help the leaders; Mullēriyāvē Gunaratana, Talāhēnē Amaramōli, Ratmalānē Sumanatissa, Koṭuvēgoḍa Gñānānanda, Heyyantuduḍuvē Devamitta, Polvattē Sōmānanda, Koṣkandavala Sunanda and Valānē Dhammānanda for Hikkāduvē Sumangala.

ekamsam katvā and ekamsa-sugata-mahā-cīvaram). Both parties claimed victory. This was a serious problem for the mahānāyakas, as both parties were^{of} their own sect. Hikkaḍuvē was the humble follower and supporter of the tradition of the mahānāyakas, and Dhammālōka was also one of the most brilliant scholars of the Siamese sect.

Even after two years, they had not received the decision of the Malvatta, and Sumangala wrote to Malvatta, on 15.12.1886, inviting the judgement.²⁸ As a reply in a letter from the anunāyaka it is stated that the leaders of both sides would be invited to Kandy to have a peaceful discussion.²⁹

Realising the effects of the controversies held earlier, this time Malvatta cleverly averted the precarious position, but both parties, the followers and sometimes the leaders, continued their controversy throughout the Island. At Telangapāta, Galle and Raygama³⁰ discussions were held on this issue. At some meetings bhikkhus signed a promise to cover both shoulders. This came to a halt when a bhikkhu who signed a document of that nature became paralysed, and there

28.Y.Paññānanda, op.cit, Vol.ii, pp.626-627.

29.Letter of Tibbaṭuvāvē Siddhārtha Sumangala on 23.12.1886 to Sumangala, ibid, pp.627-628.

30.Sometimes this controversy is known as Raygama Vādaya because of this.

was a belief that gods had punished him for helping to ruin the Buddhist church.

The peace formula was not accepted by both parties and the most troublesome meeting was held at Galle. Not only the bhikkhus but the laymen were divided into two sides and were arguing on the point. The speakers were laymen and bhikkhus were listening. Devotees with thugs then intruded into temples and threatened the bhikkhus of Tuvakkugalavatta temple, which was governed by Sumangala, with death if they covered both shoulders or instructed the novices to cover them when going for alms on the streets, and they never allowed bhikkhus to take part in religious activities if they had covered both shoulders.

Without forgetting the obvious implications of this debate on the bhikkhu and lay societies, one could ask, was there any other personal gain in the background of the controversy? The two traditional seats of learning established by the two leaders of the controversy, were engaged in a healthy rivalry with each other. Vidyodaya and Vidyāḷankāra pirivenas both belonged to the Siamese sect, and the bhikkhus of Amarapura and Rāmañña had not any organisation of this calibre. To enrol the support of these two sects this method of covering both shoulders

was fruitful. Then only the students would not find 22.
themselves in an embarrassing position with their
colleagues in the classroom, as all were covering both
shoulders, and no petty personal differences could occur.
Otherwise, a discussion between the high-priests of the
Amarapura sect and Sumangala is inexplicable. He was not
governed by any vinaya rule to declare his views in front
of them. He should have done this with the high-priests
of his own sect, who perhaps would not have allowed him
to enter a controversy, Vidyodaya pirivena had a good
harvest after the controversy, while Vidyāḷankāra pirivena
was losing its ground among the bhikkhus of the Amarapura
and Rāmañña sects, although those of the Siamese sect
who were studying at Vidyodaya, covered only one shoulder
when they left. This went on for a long time, and even by
the end of the century when the high-priests of the
Siamese sect were entering their student-novices to the
pirivena the foremost advice they gave was 'You go to
Vidyodaya, merely for education, but not to wear robes'. 31

A word of explanation about the different sects is
needed here. During the time of Kīrti Śrī Rājasinha, a

31. This was the advice received by K. Vanaratana nāyaka thera,
when entering Vidyodaya pirivena in the 1930s, and may
still be applicable today. In the whole Mātara District
only four temples of the Siamese sect, which were under
the teachership of Hungangoḍa priest, cover both shoulders.

delegation was sent to Siam inviting bhikkhus to confer higher ordination on the novices of Ceylon. The Sinhalese bhikkhus who received the upasampadā from these Siamese bhikkhus were called the Siamese sect or Syāmopāli Vamsaya after the name of Upāli, the head of the delegation.

Some bhikkhus of Kandy at a later stage complained to the king, that in spite of his assistance he was destroying the Buddhist church by giving upasampadā to the bhikkhus of the drummer caste (tantavāya kula). This allegation was most probably aimed at Vēhāllē Dhammadinna of the Beravā or Nākāti caste, the pupil of Siṭṭināmaluvē Dhammajōti of Durāva caste. The king, to purify the church according to the views of the priests of Kandy then imposed a Code of Rules (Katikāvata) for bhikkhus, which stressed the terms 'jāti gōtra vicārā'.³² This phrase was interpreted by the Kandyan monks for their own benefit, and only the bhikkhus of the Govigama caste were able to receive the upasampadā in the Siamese sect.

The bhikkhus of other castes were then forbidden to receive the higher ordination in the Siamese sect,

32. Most controversial phrase. Some interpret jāti as birth and gōtra as a doublet word going with jāti meaning the socially accepted position by birth, not the caste.

and without that they are not recognised as bhikkhus. There is hardly any difference between a devotee and a novice, who has no higher ordination. Once when the rich Mudliars of the Salāgama caste of the low-country, appealed to the mahānāyaka of Malvatta to confer the higher ordination on the bhikkhus of Salāgama caste, the proposition was tacitly turned down by the mahānāyaka saying ' If we do so, bhikkhus from Karāwe and Radā castes would apply for the same and that would definitely ruin the Sāsana'.³³

An energetic bhikkhu of the Salāgama(or Halāgama) caste, who had earlier received upasampadā at Malvatta,³⁴ before the caste implications were rigidly forced by the mahānāyaka, with six other novices went to Burma³⁵ at the expense of wealthy Mudliars of his caste, who were searching for a chance to see the caste which they belonged to, compete with the Govigama based Siamese sect. This Āmbagahapitiyē Gñānavimala of Vālitara after receiving his upasampadā from the Sangharāja of Burma (Amarapura) observed 'nisa' (five year period of instruction with a teacher), and after

33. A document sent by Mudliars to the mahānāyaka Dhammakkhandha. (Ceylon National Archives).

34. This is a controversial statement. The scholars of the Siamese sect have omitted the historical facts from the history of the Buddhist church of the recent past.

35. OR 1025.

coming back to Ceylon, started the new sect called 'Amarapura sect', after giving higher ordination to novices at a water-consecrated boundary in Mādu Gaṅga, Balapiṭṭiya, on the Vesak Full Moon day of 1803.

Kapugama Dhammakhandha, another bhikkhu of the Salāgama caste,³⁶ with the same intention went to Burma for ordination and came to Doḍandūva, where in January 1811, at a consecrated water-boundary in Gin Gaṅga, he gave the higher ordination and so founded the 'Daḍalla branch of the Amarapura sect'. Some bhikkhus of the Govigama caste who were dissatisfied with the Siamese sect also received shelter under this sect.³⁷

In refusing to accept the authority of Malvatta, the active spirit was shown not only by bhikkhus of the Salāgama community. Kataluvē Gunaratanatissa of the Karāwe caste, who received his upasampadā in the Siamese sect twice,³⁸ was dissatisfied when controversy arose between Malvatta and Asgiriya regarding the purity of their own upasampadā ceremony.³⁹ As he had

36. There are two sub-divisions of the Salāgama caste;
1. Kurūdupannē 2. Hēvapannē.

37. Daḍalu Sāsana Vamsaya, an unprinted hand-written work lying at Vālukārāmaya, Daḍalla, Galle.

38. He received upasampadā at Purāna Vihārāya, Toṭagamuva, and when doubts arose then at Kāṭangoḍa water-boundary near Tangalle.

39. OR 6603 (216), Sīmā Samkara Vinodinī by Yaṭanvila Siri Sunanda, the mahānāyaka of Asgiriya chapter written in 1826.

received his new upasampadā at Kalyāṇi Sīmā in Burma, the boundary which the Sinhalese bhikkhus of the fifteenth century had erected to give upasampadā to the Burmese bhikkhus, to distinguish his newly founded sect it was named after the Sīmā, 'Kalyāṇivamsa Mahā Nikāya' of the Amarapura sect, in 1811.

Though the caste elements were comparatively inactive at that time, instinctively the minds of other communities were diverted to various channels to express their oppression. Attudāvē Dhammarakkhita of the Durāva caste received upasampadā in Burma and in 1818 (1817 ?) started the 'Amarapura Śrī Dharmarakṣita Nikāya', sometimes called 'Mīripānnē Nikāya'.

In the areas of the up-country dissatisfaction towards Malvatta was spreading, and Bōgahapiṭṭiyē Dhammajoti of Halāgama caste, after coming back from Burma founded the 'Uḍaraṭa Amarapura Nikāya' (1807), and later his pupil Rahupola Sujāta, with his teacher's consent, started 'the 'Ūva Amarapura Nikāya'.

The first founder of the Amarapura Nikāya was so powerful during his lifetime that he was issued a declaration by the Governor Sir Edward Barnes stating that 'no one in the low-country could enter the Buddhist church without his consideration', but he

sympathetically rejected this proclamation and appealed for its cancellation, in 1825.⁴⁰

Mātara Dhammārāma of the Siamese sect, without receiving upasampadā lived as a novice^{was}, concerned about the impure state of the boundary at Malvatta and Asgiriya. At a weekly Pirit chanting ceremony at Paḍavtoṭa, Māgālle, he said that rhythmical chanting by two priests was prohibited according to Vinaya rules, and being dissatisfied with the bhikkhus of Siamese sect he received upasampadā in the Kalyāṇivamsa Nikāya, and founded 'Amarapura Saddhammayuktika Nikāya' or Mātara Nikāya in 1841.

When the time of our discussion arises, therefore Amarapura Nikāya was divided into seven chapters, but they were a powerful force against the authority of the Siamese sect. Though the caste implications could be seen in the foundation of every new chapter, they all belonged to the intimidated communities and they believed Govigama caste and the Siamese sect to be their common opponent.

In the Amarapura sect there were bhikkhus of four castes, namely Halāgama, Karāwe, Durāva and of Govigama who severed connections with the Siamese sect. Salāgama

40. A copy of this declaration is hung at the Puṣpārāmaya, Vālitara now.

bhikkhus believed their origin to be in a Brahmin village called SALĀ in the Kosol country in India. The Durāva monks refrained from joining in religious functions with the bhikkhus of other castes. Govigama bhikkhus who lived in Saparagamuva areas were always on good terms with the Salāgama priests, but their upasampadā ceremonies were conducted separately.

The higher ordination ceremony of the bhikkhus of the Salāgama caste was carried out on Mādu Gaṅga at Balapitiya, with the assistance of Salmon De Soyza Appuhāmy. After deciding on a consecrated boundary of water, the devotees erected a pavilion, which supplied accommodation for nearly a hundred bhikkhus, on stone pillars. To reach the pavilion they built a bridge of planks and when the auspicious hour appeared they removed the planks to disconnect the banks of the river from the boundary. This was the prevailing system from 1845.

But in 1851, they performed the higher ordination ceremony without dissociating the land from the boundary, without removing those planks. When ropes and other elements of the bridge exist on the boundary it is called 'Samkara Dōsa' (fault of hybridism), and Lankāgoḍa Dhīrānanda, scholar and the pupil of Bōpāgoḍa Sirisumana, the ganācariya mahānāyaka, disclaimed the

purity of the boundary and complained about it to his teacher. The matter was taken seriously, and the mahānāyaka thera ordered the bhikkhus who had received the upasampadā in the samkara sīmā, to be purified in a pure boundary. The novices were brought to Ratgam Oya at Dodandūva, where bhikkhus of Karāwe caste performed the ceremony after removing the planks that connected to the land, and they were re-given upasampadā.

Feeling satisfied with the new ceremony, Bōpāgoḍa Sirisumana then sent^{an} appeal to Dhammādhāratissa thera of Vālitara, to reissue the upasampadā to those who had already received it in the 'impure boundary', on Mādugaṅga. He felt uncertain about the incident and convened a meeting of bhikkhus at his temple, and most of them were ready to re-receive the higher ordination. But two pupils of Dhammādhāratissa, Gñānānanda and Balapiṭṭiyē, were against the move and they challenged Lankāgoḍa Dhīrānanda to prove the impurity of the sīmā. The ceremony did not take place, but a debate was held at Dūvē Vihāraya.

It is quite baffling to see that at this meeting Bōpāgoḍa, who had accepted his pupil's view and taken action in order to rectify the situation, declared that he now had no belief in the impure state of the boundary as stated by Lankāgoḍa and withdrew his appeal

to re-receive the upasampadā. Furthermore he suggested that a controversy should take place at Talpiṭṭiya Vihāraya in Kalutara North, for a clear decision between Gñānānanda and Lankāgoḍa. Lankāgoḍa was in a great dilemma and he could not act freely or according to his will as he was the most talented and faithful student of his teacher, but he was unable to refrain from trying to prove his theory on a scholarly activity. Sīmā Samkara Vādaya dragged on for some time and at Būssa Raja Mahā Vihāraya, another discussion was held with the followers of both parties. Unfortunately no decision was reached.

In 1855, Ganācariya Bōpāgoḍa ordered Lankāgoḍa to present himself at a debate on the matter. This time Lankāgoḍa was adamant and remonstrated with his teacher on the unscrupulous way he had carried out the controversy at the three attempts he made earlier to state his views, and said that his presence would occur only if there was a third party to issue an impartial judgement on the contention. The third party should be conversant with the ecclesiastical rules of the Order. While the correspondence was going hither and thither between the teacher and the pupil, Gñānānanda at a meeting convened by him denounced the unacceptable

behaviour of Lankāgoḍa and passed 'the act of non-participation' with him in religious matters.

The information of his expulsion was given by Dhammadinna therā, to an incredulous Lankāgoḍa. Then at a meeting he held at his Ganēgoḍālla Vihāraya, Kosgoḍa, with nearly a hundred sthaviras and two hundred bhikkhus and laymen, after a discussion over the affair they sent specially written letters to the ganācariya mahānāyaka therā and Gñānānanda challenging their views on the purity of the boundary with quotations from commentaries. The supporters of Lankāgoḍa knew most of the hearers were adherents of Lankāgoḍa and appealed to them to sign the document if they had faith in the statement made by Lankāgoḍa on the boundary, as it was the same idea accepted by the ganācariya mahānāyaka therā in his letter to the bhikkhus before he had changed his colours. Concluding the meeting they conferred a similar 'act of non-participation' in religious rites with the bhikkhus of Amarapura unless they re-issued upasampadā to the bhikkhus who had received it at an impure boundary on Mādugaṅga.

The only hope for a reconciliation now seemed to lie at the feet of the Sangharāja of Burma, and Lankāgoḍa was so adamant with his view that he submitted a letter

to him inviting his decision on the purity of the boundary. Lankāgoḍa was informed in return that his views on the matter were acceptable. His opponents were not ready to accept the views of the Sangharāja, though they normally had all reverence and fear for him. Their claimed unity had disappeared. The Sangharāja wrote a letter to the high priests of Amarapura on the correctness of Lankāgoḍa's statement and he clarified it with illustrations and diagrams, and appealed to them to be united. Lankāgoḍa heard of this letter but never read it. The Sangharāja realised that the bhikkhus of Amarapura had refused his infallible sovereignty over them, and addressed two letters to Bulatgama Sirisumanatissa and Paññāmolī, inviting their attention to unite the monks of Amarapura in his name. Only Lankāgoḍa reacted to this appeal for agreement, but not Bōpāgoḍa.

Bōpāgoḍa cunningly arranged a meeting at Ambalangoḍa where one can hardly find a Salāgama bhikkhu or a Salāgama villager. In July 1860, Bōpāgoḍa, Lankāgoḍa and Gñānānanda and about seventy bhikkhus of Karāwe caste were present at the meeting. Salamon De Soyza, the English judge from the neighbouring courts, Vijayagunaratana Abhayasinha Mudliar and some police officers acted as the 'impartial' judges.

Sirisumana and Paññāmolī read the letters of appeal from the Sangharāja, and appealed for unity of the bhikkhus in the name of their religious sovereign. Both parties agreed for a reconciliation, but no one wanted to give up his view on the controversy. Some bhikkhus of the Lankāgoḍa camp wanted to be read the letters sent by the Sangharāja on this matter. Sirisumana stated that he had been unable to bring them to the meeting. Then a student of Lankāgoḍa, Paññāsīha, gave the first letter sent by the Sangharāja, to Sirisumana and he read the Pali version twice or thrice, without translating it into Sinhalese, so that the bhikkhus and the laymen who were present could not understand what it was. Since it dealt with the accuracy of the statement made by Lankāgoḍa, Paññāsīha took the letter and after reading the Pali version, translated it sentence by sentence into Sinhalese in public. Jeerings and catcalls were heard from the opponents. Gñānānanda threatened the reader to stop it.

In the end, the meeting completely refused the solemn appeal of the Sangharāja, and their adamant attitude helped Paññāmolī and Sirisumana to collect the signatures of the priests who had faith in the ganācariya mahānāyaka Bōpāgoḍa. Only twentyeight signatories were found. Bōpāgoḍa in public declared

that their view was accepted by the Sangharāja and pretended that he had made all attempts to call for a reconciliation and that the Sangharāja's appeal had been dismissed and opposed by Lankāgoḍa.

Whatever their conspiracies were now, they could not help the people from understanding the reality of the problem and the following day Bōpāgoḍa, Dhammādhāratissa and his disciples performed a higher ordination ceremony at Mādampē Mōdara, without informing Lankāgoḍa and announced that they had accepted the view declared by the Sangharāja of Burma. This state of affairs apparently shows that though they never accepted the theory of Lankāgoḍa publicly they had consciously accepted the correctness of his view. After this, the student-teacher relationship between Lankāgoḍa and Bōpāgoḍa was severely undermined, though not completely destroyed, and in a long letter to the Sangharāja Lankāgoḍa illustrated the events of the meeting and called for unity. In it he accused the organizers for convening a meeting on a controversial point raised by a Salāgama bhikkhu for the Salāgamas, at a village where no Halāgama people were living. Though accusations were made against him by his own teacher, he observes silence because his heart overflows with reverence to his teacher. He admitted that his position in society

and in academic fields ^{was} ~~is~~ due to his instruction. And he accused Bulatgama Sirisumanatissa of acting in a partial manner at the meeting and said that the conclusion had been arrived at not on theoretical grounds but on personal grounds.

His expectations could be fulfilled only if a delegation arrived from Burma, and he appealed to the Sangharāja to send ten high priests from Burma in his name, to advise the Amarapura sect.⁴¹ Lankāgoda knew that the adamant attitude of his opponents would definitely change in front of these representatives. His expectation for the bright future of the united Amarapura Nikāya had been shattered and he now founded a new group different from Amarapura Nikāya and called himself the founder of the 'Amarapura Saddhammavamsika Nikāya', in 1862. Other bhikkhus of the Amarapura sect, after this event, called themselves 'Amarapura Mūlavamsika Nikāya' and for the first time an ineradicable rift had sprung up in the Amarapura sect.

When we examine the Amarapura sect closely, we see it was established as an outlet to express the humiliation of the other castes, save Govigama, at the hands of the Siamese sect. It developed along the line of caste

41. OR 6605 (5). A long handwritten ola leaf letter discussing the history of the controversy which was sent to the Sangharāja by Lankāgoda is preserved at the British Museum.

inclinations. Sīmā Samkara Vādaya for a long time divided the bhikkhus who had been fighting against a common enemy into new rival groups. The unity of the oppressed castes inside one Amarapura Sect had been shattered, and the serpent of caste affiliations began to raise its ugly head.

The attempts of the Sangharāja, though they failed thrice, never came to an end. In 1871, Doḍandūvē Piyaratana of Kalyāṇivamsa sect sent a letter to Dīpālankāra Rājaguru mahāthera, of Mandalay, discussing how the gravity of the disruption has been increased by the division of bhikkhus and laymen into Samkaravādin and Asamkaravādin. And now re-receiving of the higher ordination has also become an act to be doubted. The Burmese monks were in favour of this observance of Dalhīkarmaya. Piyaratana nāyaka thera who performed it with his two hundred followers accepted this as an essential act for gaining the super-disciplinary plane. Dhammādhāratissa of Gangārāmaya, Galle, with his twenty pupils left the Nikāya after criticising Piyaratana's view on Dalhīkarmaya. Piyaratana asked for an order from the Sangharāja with a declaration on the necessity of Dalhīkarma for an upasampadā bhikkhu.⁴² Later he invited

42. A letter by Piyaratana-tissa nāyaka thera, now lying at Sailabimbārāmaya, Doḍandūva.

all the priests of Amarapura to Śailabimbārāmaya to have a discussion on the need for unity among the bhikkhus of the sect.

In 1873, Uḍugalpiṭṭiyē Sirisumanatissa mahānāyaka thera of Kalyāṇivamsa Nikāya, invited Jāgara thera of Burma to visit Ceylon, and to advise the disunited monks of Amarapura sect. Jāgara thera accepted the invitation and came to Galle, in March 1876 (1877?) and was received by Sampson De Abrew Vijayagunaratana Rajapakṣa, Vāsala Mudliar of Vālitara who lived in his coconut grove 'Kohilavaguravatta' at Kosgoḍa. Before his arrival in Ceylon Jāgara thera had composed a book, 'Sīmā Samkara Viniścaya', and after printing three hundred copies, had sent them to those who were engaged in the controversy.⁴³ That was commented on by the 'impurity claimers' (asuddhavādin or samkaravādin) as follows;

"gatē sīmāva samkara bavaṭa yasā
 ātē kadima upamāvak hāngena lesā
 matē udāgiri sandahiru dedena lesā
 potē samkaraya pāhādili veyi yasaśā"⁴⁴

43. Jāgara thera, Lankā Sāsana Visuddhi Kathā, translated into Sinhalese by Dhammatilaka, p.115.

44. Samkara Kurullā, verse 33, p.5.

(The impurity of the boundary has been illustrated in that book -of Jāgara- as the brightness of the sun and the moon on the Eastern mountains.)

At that time the other sub-controversy, affiliated with the Samkara Vādaya, started to emerge. Accusations were made against those who received the higher ordination for the second time, and this controversy on Dalhikarma increased the disunity among the bhikkhus of Amarapura. To eradicate all the controversial points, during his stay in Ceylon, Jāgara wrote another compilation 'Lankā Sāsana Visuddhi Kathā' in October 1878. He arrived at decisions on the two existing controversies, and discussed the unsuitability of bhikkhus using ^{betel}~~betel~~ ^{leaves}~~leaves~~ having tea in the afternoons, smoking, wearing slippers, uncovering the body and using money. But unfortunately his efforts for the unification of Amarapura could not be described as successful. By political charges he was forced to leave the country by the king of Burma.

The compilation of Jāgara was translated into Sinhalese and distributed free among readers. Dhammatilaka sthavira of Śrī Vardhanārāmaya, translator and publisher of the book, mentioned in the preface his keenness to see a united Amarapura sect and, furthermore, he suggested that since no unity had been reached none of the Amarapurians would take any further steps towards

unity. Meanwhile the Samkaravādins continued their activities further and charged the bhikkhus of Āmbagahapiṭṭiya with having no higher ordination and not even being pious persons, saying that they were lower than lay devotees.

"Āmbagahapiṭṭiye pansal pasehī yatingē
 upasapuva nomātmāyi mē lesin sev bālūvot
 heranasikada nātmāyi sil gānīmak nomātten
 dāna dāna boru bas kīmen enāti veyi daham sē" ⁴⁵

(That the bhikkhus of Āmbagahapiṭṭiya have no upasampadā, is clear to the observer. By deliberate lying they have forsworn the precepts.)

A Royal minister arrived in Galle under the instructions of the King of Burma to unite the Amarapurians, and held a meeting on 29.9.1879. In 1892, Sangharāja Vajirārāma visited Ceylon, and advised the bhikkhus to be united under one head. It appears this solution could not be arrived at. Their caste affinities were much stronger than affiliations with religion or sect. After reviewing the affair Vajirārāma stressed that the bhikkhus of Āmbagahapiṭṭiya must re-receive the upasampadā.

45.op.cit, verse 46,p.7.

"Balapiṭṭi muvadorehi sīmāva samkara
 vanahāṭi kiya Vajirārāma yativara
 Āmbapiṭṭi mahana haṭa punasikaya vāratara
 sita aṭi kara labana lesa kiya sārakara".⁴⁶

(Vajirārāma thera has illustrated clearly the impurity of the boundary at Balapiṭṭi mōdara, and has stressed that the bhikkhus of Āmbagahapiṭṭiya must observe the upasampadā again.)

The bhikkhus of Āmbagahapiṭṭiya (Mūlavamsika Nikāya) then performed a ceremony at Horakālē, and received their upasampadā, and the editor of 'Dalhīkarma Haṭanaya' commented on the inflexible attitude of those bhikkhus who for nearly thirty years had been admired by Buddhists though they were no different from upāsakas except that they wore yellow robes.

Even after this there were little differences in the minds of the Amarapura bhikkhus, but a nominal unification was thus brought about. Āmbagahapiṭṭiyē Vimalasāratissa was the chief priest of the Mūlavamsika Nikāya. On 27.3.1892 at Gorakāna temple, Vaskaḍuvē, Vāligama, Doḍandūva and Vēhāllē priests coalesced with Āmbagahapiṭṭiya monks in performing a Dalhīkarma and thus the most prolonged controversy in the history of Amarapura sect came to an end with the unification of

46. Dalhī Karma Haṭanaya, verse 111, p.17.

the chapters.⁴⁷

On the 12th of June 1864, the religious history of the Island witnessed the birth of a new revivalistic movement among the bhikkhus. The Rāmañña sect became the most influential sect among the various religious sects of the country. The founder of the sect was 'Sāsanavamsa Kavidhaja Sirisaddhammācariya Yatisanghapati Indāsabha Varagñāna Āmbagahavattē Saranankara mahānāyaka thera'. A close analysis of his life apparently exhibits the mind of a strong and pious character who has dedicated his life to the religion.⁴⁸ He was a seeker of truth and even after entering the existing Siamese and Amarapura sects his thirst for mental purity could not be fulfilled. He was one of the novices who accompanied Bentara Atthadassi in 1855, to receive the upasampadā at Malvatta and later when the controversy occurred between Bentara and Malvatta he again received the higher ordination in 1856 at the Kālani river. At a time when the bhikkhus of the Siamese sect were entertaining doubts regarding the upasampadā given at Malvatta and Asgiriya to the novices, this newly consecrated water boundary in the Kālani river might have been established as a pure substitute.

47. Some of the materials for this discussion were taken from the reports at the Sailabimbārāma Library, Doḍandūva.

48. He died on 29.1.1886.

Āmbagahavattē Saranankara who had been dragged from one controversial boundary to another by his teachers must have felt disgusted of the lives of the bhikkhus of the Siamese sect and subsequently gave up robes and became a devotee who observed the ten precepts. But he did not give up his curiosity on religious purity and again entered the Order of bhikkhus as a member of the Amarapura sect under the guidance of Bulatgama Sirisumanatissa.⁴⁹ At Vijayānanda Vihāraya, Galle, where he was residing he met the bhikkhus who ^{had}/returned from abroad after receiving their upasampadā at Ratanāpuṇṇa in the Rāmañña country. He found that even in the Amarapura sect the prolonged controversy on the purity of the boundary and the controversy on the re-receiving of the upasampadā had created a disruption in the sect, and suspicions arose on the higher ordination given to the novices by the high priests of the Amarapura sect. As a man who had a great faith and devotion to religious purity, a difference of opinion of this nature must have severely affected his way of thought. He proceeded to Burma in search of pure religious practices and on 12.6.1861 received the higher ordination⁵⁰ and the Dalhikarma at the river Iravādi,⁵¹ and to

49. Kotmalē Sirisaddhammavamsa, Āmbagahavattē Indāsabha Varagñāna Sāmi Mahānāyaka Svāmīndra Caritaya, (1950), pp.17-18.

50. *ibid*, p.42.

51. *ibid*, p.46.

achieve a more pure state he received the Dalhīkarma again at Pegu from the bhikkhus of the Forest Dwellers (vanavāsa), and returned to Galle on 18.8.1862. On his arrival he was received by Bulatgama Sirisumanatissa and Hikkāduvē Sumangala. The receipt of upasampadā and Dalhīkarma six times is ample evidence for his dedication to the Order, and he clearly realised the impurity or controversiality of the higher ordination received by the novices of both sects, Siamese and Amarapura.

During his stay at Pahala Fansala in Galle and Dūvē Fansala in Payāgala⁵² he had discussions with Bulatgama nāyaka thera and decided not to perform any act of participation in religious duties with the bhikkhus of the existing sects in Ceylon. Puvakdandāvē Paññānanda thera, a forest dwelling bhikkhu, who earlier entered the Order as a member of the Siamese sect and at a later day entered and received the higher ordination in the Amarapura sect, paid a visit to Āmbagahavattē thera and confessed his wish to receive the higher ordination in the Rāmañña country in order to purify himself. He left the Island on 17.9.1862 and received the upasampadā in the Kalyāṇi Sīmā at the city of Hamsāvātī and returned to Galle.⁵³

52. Mūla Mahā Vihāraya and presently known as Dharmagupta Pirivena, Payāgala.

53. Puvakdandāvē Paññānanda Caritaya, pp. 2-5, K. Sirisaddhammavamsa, op. cit, Appendix, p. 146.

Āmbagahavattē and Puvakdandāvē decided to perform a new higher ordination ceremony and were in search of an Upādhyāya. On their way to Anurādhapura they met Varāpiṭṭiyē Sirisumitta mahāthera, who had entered the Siamese sect and received the higher ordination at Malvatta in 1823, and feeling disgusted at the controversy on the boundary between Malvatta and Asgiriya, left the Island in 1844 for Siam where he had entered the Dhammayuktika Nikāya, a sect which originated in the Rāmañña country and developed separately from the bhikkhus of Siam.⁵⁴ He had received higher ordination there and returned to Ceylon in 1853 and was living at Vijayanandanārāmaya, Kūmbiyangoda, Matale.⁵⁵ Varāpiṭṭiyē Sirisumitta consented to perform the duties of the Mahōpādhyāya in the higher ordination ceremony.⁵⁶

Meanwhile Āmbagahavattē was accepted by some bhikkhus, as their leader, who were dissatisfied with the present situation of their colleagues. In Gñeyya Dhamma Munivara Mangala Sangharāja Sīmā, at Mahamōdara, Galle, on 12.6.1864 the Rāmañña sect performed its first upasampadā ceremony and conferred higher ordination on four novices.⁵⁷

54. A.P. Buddhaddatta, Pāli Sandēsāvali, p.90.

55. Presently known as Vidyāsēkhara Pirivena.

56. K. Sirisaddhammavamsa, op.cit, p.75.

57. Sangiti Patraya of the Rāmañña sect written on .

12.7.1864. This is reproduced in, ibid, pp.73-75.

Varāpiṭṭiyē Sirisumitta was appointed as Mahōpādhyāya while Ambagahavattē and Puvakdandāvē participated as Kammācariyas.

The newly founded sect was an attempt to recall the purity of the bhikkhus in the olden times and was considerably strengthened by the unification with the Vanavāsa Sēnāsanas where bhikkhus of the other sects, dissatisfied at the behaviour of others, engaged in religious duties in lonely forests. The two associated founders of the Rāmañña sect, Varāpiṭṭiyē Sumitta and Puvakdandāvē Paññānanda, were residents of Vijayanandanā-rāmaya in Kūmbiyangoḍa and Kaṭutiyāmbārāvē Sēnāsānaya in the Kuruviṭa area respectively. Their association with the new sect created an overwhelming interest in the other existing forest dwellings to join the sect and many Vanavāsins followed the example of Varāpiṭṭiyē and Puvakdandāvē. The paramount status ascribed to the higher ordination which Varāpiṭṭiyē Sirisumitta received in the Dhammayuktika Nikāya, and his position as the Eldest bhikkhu of the Vanavāsins were impressive factors in the minds of the Vanavāsins and they followed him. ⁵⁸

58. The bhikkhus who dwelt in the Sēnāsanas at Uḍugalmotē, Kaḍavādduva, Kosgahadola, Kirinda, Akurāssa, Āturaliya, Baṭuvīṭa, Aranvala, Balangoḍa, Kuruviṭa, Dumbara, Uḍu Dumbarā, Alulena, Nārādeniya, Valakaḍē, Horodduva, Nālanda, Matale, Yaṭṭinuvara, Maradankaḍavala, Nakālē, Puliyankulama, Kaṭṭumuriccānē, Labunōru Kālē, Hiripīṭiya Gama, Nikavāraṭiya, Baṭugedara, Rāssagala, Dunuvila, Mādolē, Ranasgōḍa, Hakmana, Puvakgahamaditta, Alutvala, Tebuvana and Ratnapura.

These scattered Sēnāsanās or Vivēkasthānās in most parts of the Island bear evidence to the dissatisfied lives of bhikkhus who had renounced the world in search of mental emancipation. The founders of the Rāmañña sect stressed that the forests should be the best dwellings for bhikkhus rather than temples in the villages and towns. The novelty of the idea aroused immense support. The followers of the Rāmañña sect were addressed by Buddhists as 'Vanavāsa Samāgama'⁵⁹ and the common Buddhists thought that these bhikkhus were more pious and meditation-minded than the bhikkhus who were living in the village temples in those days.

Not only their dwellings gave them a modern appearance among the other bhikkhus but many other characteristics have helped to attract the minds of the laity. The bhikkhus of the Rāmañña sect do not shave the eye-brows, unlike the bhikkhus of the Siamese sect. They cover both shoulders, like the Amarapurians, with their robes, especially cut and woven with 'nuvā, nuvā atta, bāhanta, gāb, changeyya, gīveyya and ghanṭhipāsa'.⁶⁰ On the bhikkhu's back there hangs a black coloured smoke-scented

59. Popularly ridiculed as 'bāddē nikāya' or 'kālā nikāya'.

60. Most of these terms are not in use among the bhikkhus of the other sects but Mātalē Sāsanatilaka thera, the secretary of the Sect, believes those are the traditional terms, referring to various portions of the cloth.

alms bowl which he will use in search of food from house to house. The preparation of food in the temple is not allowed and the bhikkhus had to live by begging food. At a time when the laymen were not used to this new scheme . . . most of the bhikkhus of the Rāmañña sect had to lead a hard life on rice alone without curries. ⁶¹ Like the bhikkhus of the Siamese and Amarapura sects they also would visit the alms houses but they follow a different practice in partaking of the food. They accept food and other offerings when the devotees repeat the words 'imam bhikkham saparikkhāram bhikkhu sanghassa dēma' (We offer this food with the offerings to the bhikkhus), and chant the sentence for merit (pin vākya) in short as compared to the long rhythmical sentence used by the bhikkhus of the Siamese sect ⁶² in Sinhalese.

At a funeral the bhikkhus of the Siamese sect and the Amarapura sect visit the house of the deceased, and at a fixed time they accompany the procession to the cemetery with all the other^s who have assembled there. And at the cemetery the bhikkhus chant a verse in Pali ⁶³ while the relatives of the dead will 'pour water' in the name of the dead. But the bhikkhus of the Rāmañña sect

61. Vimalānanda Caritaya, p. 32.

62. A long sentence which starts with 'metān paṭan...'.
 63. itthitam patthitam tuyham khippameva samijjhatu and
 unnamē udakam vuṭṭham yathā ninnam pavattati.

without accompanying the dead to the cemetery chant the verses with the relatives and pour water in the deceased's house.

The bhikkhus of the Siamese sect were caste conscious and only the Govigama were allowed to enter the Order. In the Amarapura sect there prevailed no caste restriction on entering the Order, but there existed caste sentiments on performing religious duties. Only in the Rāmañña sect has caste hardly any role to play. There were two mahānāyakas at Malvatta and Asgiriya and one in the Kālaṇi Nikāya of the Siamese sect and in the Amarapura Sect there were seven mahānāyakas ; but the Rāmañña Sect has its own single mahānāyaka.

The Siamese Sect performs its upasampadā ceremonies at the Baddha Sīmā in Malvatta and Asgiriya, and the Kālaṇi Sect in a water consecrated boundary. Amarapurians too have the ceremony at an udakukkhepa Sīmā and so does the Rāmañña Sect. The Rāmañña Sect has neither a fixed time nor a fixed place for their higher ordination.

The bhikkhus of the Amarapura and Siamese sects carry a cloth umbrella, but the Rāmañña sect hold a palm leaf umbrella (tal atta, gotu atta, bōgāva), for the sun and the rain. The Rāmañña devotees address the bhikkhu as 'avasara' (excuse me please). No images of gods should be erected at temple premises and no offerings of food and

other requisities shall be offered to them. At Pirit chanting ceremonies no Dorakaḍa Asna⁶⁴ will be chanted. The two seat sermons (yugāsana bana) are prohibited for the Rāmañña bhikkhus. After the devotee has uttered the nine lines of taking refuge in the Buddha, Dhamma and Sangha the priest of the Rāmañña sect will say, 'Saranāgamanam Sampunṇam' (You have finished taking refuge) and the devotee will answer 'Āma bhante' (Yes Sir). At the opening of the Pansil the devotee will have to say 'Okāsa aham bhantē tisananēna saddhim pancasīlam dhammam yācāmi' (Sir I beg you for the Five Precepts). At the end he will repeat after the priest 'Tisananēna saddhim pancasīlam dhammam sādhuḥkam katvā appamādena sampādetha' (You should profoundly observe the Precepts and the refuge in the Triple Gem without hesitation). Finally the devotee will say 'āma bhantē'. The bhikkhus of the Rāmañña sect believe strongly in the passing away of Lord Buddha and do not use any symbol which could represent him. They refrain from coffee and tea in the afternoon.⁶⁵ The handling of money or asking for

64. Dorakaḍa Asna is a dramatic interlude presented on the last day of the weekly chanting of Pirit where the messenger (Dēvadūṭayā) who has been to invite the gods of the nearby dēvālē to listen the sermon, informs the priests of their arrival with him and invites the priests to chant the Pirit. A very colourful presentation in a Buddhist ritual.

65. They are ridiculed as 'Kottamalli Kārayō' even now, for drinking coriander water.

money from the devotees is strictly prohibited to the bhikkhus. A devotee who has dedicated his life to each of the bhikkhus (kāpakaru dāyaka) will furnish the bhikkhu with all his requisites when they are necessary, thereby allowing the bhikkhu to devote his full time to meditation and other religious affairs without wasting his time on searching for the necessities of life.

The male and female devotees (upāsaka and upāsikā) play an important role in the activities of the Rāmañña Nikāya. In the Siamese sect and the Amarapura sect there always existed a big rift between the bhikkhus and the lay devotees. Since most of the lay devotees are illiterate, they were unaware of the Ecclesiastical rules that the bhikkhus must adhere to, and it was presumed by the bhikkhus of both sects that the sphere of Vinaya rules must not be declared or trespassed on by the devotees.

But after the formation of the Rāmañña sect things suddenly changed. The bhikkhus of this sect taught the Vinaya rules to the laymen. Bhikkhus are called 'Buddha putras' (The sons of Lord Buddha) which means that they belong to the same tradition of pupillage and there is a resemblance between Buddha and the bhikkhus in the robes they wear. The devotees pay

homage to the bhikkhus since they wear the robes of Lord Buddha and thereby became ' the sons of Lord Buddha', and even after two thousand four hundred years they have to observe the rules of the Buddha. Therefore the Rāmañña Nikāya believed that these teachings of ecclesiastical rules to the devotees will give them access to the lives of the bhikkhus. When serious criticisms emerged at a later stage between the Siamese and Amarapura sects the Rāmañña sect was represented by laymen, as an outcome of this newly acquired knowledge.

The novelty of the new sect had a great influence on the laymen and they were prone to think^{that} even a meal offered to the bhikkhus of this sect would enable them to reach 'Nirvāna'. The existing dissatisfaction with the bhikkhus of the other two sects thus increased. The administrators of the day too were attentive to the activities of the new sect and a second conferment of higher ordination was held at Gampola with the assistance of the Unambuva Disāva on the Poson Full moon day in 1867, at which fourteen novices received upasampadā and one received Dalhikarma.⁶⁶

66. Sangīti Patra of the Second Higher Ordination Ceremony. I am grateful to Mātalē Sāsanatīlaka nāyaka thera for the information regarding the Rāmañña sect.

Āmbagahavattē Saranankara not only stressed purity in life but he^{also} advocated purity of the mind too. The correspondence he had with Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala while he was in Rāmañña Dēsa (Burma) and in the Dharmagupta Vihāraya, Payāgala, proves his inquisitive scholarship and his rationalistic approach to traditional knowledge. When his 'samāgama' had reached a developed state he wanted to establish his theories on various practices in religion. These theories he adduced were all critical, and vehemently contradicted the ideas of the two existing sects.

The role of gods in the practical Buddhism in Ceylon is wide-spread, and in worldly life the ordinary Buddhists seek for their help (Dēva pihiṭa).⁶⁷ He does not expect such help from the Triple Gem. After observing precepts, or worshipping Buddha, Buddhists offer some portion of the merits acquired by them to the gods. Without the help of ordinary Buddhists the gods are unable to be reborn as human beings. According to traditional Buddhism the position of gods could not be considered a particularly high one. The gods, although they could strive for Nirvāṇa, the ultimate aim of life according to Buddhism, always have to be reborn in human

67. Even now villagers, when their children go to bed, will say 'Budungē saranayi Deviyangē pihiṭayi' and letters are ended likewise.

form before they can achieve it, and thus they enjoy a lower status than human beings. But in practical Buddhism the subservient position of the gods is forgotten and they become the benevolent benefactors of human beings when they are facing dire adversities of life.

The four guardian gods of the country (Saman Boksā, Kataragama, Viṣṇu and Vibhīṣaṇa)⁶⁸ and their provincial gods (gambāra dēvatā) are believed to be the protectors of human life, and when they are propitiated with their favourite offerings they will help human beings in the necessities of life. The common Buddhist believes that these gods are also the followers of Lord Buddha and are being permitted to protect Buddhists by Lord Buddha. In accordance with these religious beliefs these gods are propitiated in every village temple and some Buddhists have elevated the gods to a superior status than that enjoyed by Lord Buddha. Āmbagahavattē rejected the idea of the very existence of gods and preached against offerings made to the gods. His pupil Suvannajōti was a great advocate of this theory and in 1891, his treatise 'Bauddha Labdhi Viśōdhani' was published against offerings of foods and other necessities to the

68. Some versions of this list add the names of Upulvan and Dādimunda while omitting the names of Vibhīṣaṇa and Viṣṇu.

planets (graha pūjā) and performing exorcistic rituals in praise of demons (yak tovil). Though offerings to gods primarily invited the attention, at a later stage when one opponent of the Rāmañña sect, Bādigama Ratanapāla of the Siamese sect, performed a Sūniyam Kāpilla(cutting the pandal of demon Sūniyam) for himself in his temple at Mātara, ⁶⁹ the bhikkhus of the Rāmañña sect expanded their arguments to cover offerings to the planets and to demons (bali and tovil). One bhikkhu of the Rāmañña sect composed another book 'Mithyā Labdhi Chēdani', ⁷⁰ and the priests of the Siamese sect and Amarapura sect made attempts with indefatigable courage to defend the existence of gods in Buddhism. This controversy (Dēva Pūjā Vādaya) dragged on for a long time.

Lord Buddha had advised his followers, the bhikkhus, to hold an umbrella of one leaf in the sun and the rain (ekapaṇṇa cattam). At this time the bhikkhus of the Amarapura and Siamese sects were using umbrellas made out of cloth, black or white in colour, while the founder of the Rāmañña sect advocated the usage of an umbrella of palm leaf. The young palm leaf makes a

69.P.A.Pieris, Vinaya Apatīcchanna Bhāva Vinīścaya,(1892), pp.17-18.

70.OR 6615 (275).

spoked umbrella after processing through a medicated system. The bhikkhus of the Amarapura and Siamese sects were fighting against the interpretation of Āmbagahavattē on this Vinaya rule and maintained that even a cloth umbrella could be counted as 'ekapaṇṇa cattam'.

Āmbagahavattē surmised that most of the books used by Buddhists of that time did not consist of the statements delivered by Lord Buddha and he affirmed that the compilation of commentaries and sub-commentaries (aṭṭuvā and ṭīkā) could be of later bhikkhus in a later period. The interpretations of Buddhaghōṣa, a famous commentator, came under the heavy criticism of the Rāmañña sect, and his followers went to the extent of rejecting every statement in these works 'as they are full of lies'. Most of the bhikkhus of the Amarapura and Siamese sects attempted to prove the scholarship of the commentators (aṭṭuvā ṭīkā boruya yana vādaya).

One of the most acclaimed bana books of the day was Hīnaṭikuṃburē Sumangala's translation of the Pali 'Milinda Pañha'. In the seventies this book called for the editorial attention of Migeṭṭuvattē Gunānanda and in 1878 it was printed for the first time. In pious Sinhalese Buddhist families the children were asked to read the book in front of their mothers after they

had come back from Christian schools where they had gained an education in Biblical studies.⁷¹ Some believed that Migeṭṭuvattē was an apparition of Nāgasēna thera; but he was one of the vehement critics of the Rāmañña sect.⁷² Āmbagahavattē and his colleague Suvannajōti and Mēdhankara preached against 'Milinda Prasānaya' and refuted the book as a 'mythical compilation, full of absurd statements on Buddhism'. Many Buddhist priests of the other sects came to the rescue of the book in this controversy.

Exaggerated versions of the physical appearance of the Lord Buddha were frequently disseminated by the preachers in the two sects, and the innocent Buddhists were prone to think of Lord Buddha as an immense figure twenty seven feet high, and saw a vast difference in the appearance of the Buddha and the Sangha. The founders of the Rāmañña sect brought down the colossal figure of Lord Buddha into an ordinary human form and had to face the criticisms of the other sects.

In 1871, Āmbagahavattē and his followers took part in a subtle controversy against the existence of a god called 'Viṣṇu' based on the derivation of the term,

71. Dharmapāla Hēvāvitārana mentioned this reading in his life sketches.

72. One of the aims of starting 'Rivirāsa' was to attack this sect.

and the bhikkhus of the Rāmañña sect totally condemned belief in Viṣṇu as anti-Buddhistic. This caused great dissatisfaction in the heart of the high priest Sumangala who accepted the popular theory of Viṣṇu being the defender of the world at that time.⁷³

Hikkāduvē Sumangala and Āmbagahavattē had much correspondence of a secret nature in regard to various theories Āmbagahavattē had been advocating with his pupils and laymen.⁷⁴ They were fact-finding friendly discussions, on the erecting of buildings by a person on a site offered to the bhikkhus of the four quarters; on the acceptance of alms when one is invited to his house; on the possibility of issuing the Kathina robes at a place where only one bhikkhu has observed Vas; on the demerits of casting images representing Lord Buddha. They did not call for public participation and did not cause any hindrance to the growth of the Rāmañña sect and in 1872 Professor T.W. Rhys Davids stated that the 'Ramanna samagama ... which strives to restore the old purity of life among the Buddhist monks was rapidly spreading'.⁷⁵

73. Up to 1956 A.D the period was called 'Viṣṇu Vimsati' by Buddhists.

74. Most of these correspondence is in the Dharmagupta Pirivena Library and the replies sent by Sumangala is reproduced in his biography. Vol. ii, pp. 692-703.

75. The Indian Antiquary, edited by Jas Burgess, Vol. 1, (May 1872), p. 162.

To propagate the theories expounded by the founder of the Rāmañña sect a society 'Sāsanadhaja' was formed, and Johānnas Pieris of Alutgama published a fortnightly magazine for the Society called 'Gñānōpāyini' on 8.1.1873.⁷⁶ Its opponents were always alert to criticise the affairs of the Rāmañña sect and when there appeared in the sixth and seventh volumes a bunch of articles on 'unvirtue'(Dussīla) and its qualities, the results of association with such people and the demerits the devotees would acquire after offerings to them, the rival critics surmised that the publication of these articles would divulge to the public that the aim underlying the Rāmañña sect was not to resuscitate Buddhism but to criticise the present generation of bhikkhus in the other two sects.⁷⁷ Twenty four numbers were issued but in November 1873 they stopped the magazine when necessary funds were not available. After the appearance of the Gñānōpāyini the protagonists of the new sect were actively engaged in controversies with the bhikkhus of the Siamese and Amarapura sects. The critics of the Rāmañña Nikāya mainly abused the

76. Lakrivikirana, 4.1.1873. (The advertisement).

77. Arut Saṅgarāva, edited by R. Dhammālōka, 1.6.1873.

founder of the sect,⁷⁸ his character and his pupils without substantiating their views on his new ideas on Buddhism. One can safely surmise that most of the critics were unable to refute the 'vinaya rules' exalted by the leaders of the Rāmañña sect. And these criticisms only helped to increase its followers.

"goṭu atten isa vasamina kuhakakamin lova ravaṭana
duṭu guna sita tula saṅgavā dāna dāna borubas tepalana"

(These hypocrites, covering the head with a palm-leaf, deceive the world, lying consciously, and pretend to be morally good and virtuous.)

"ekapansata koyi lesakin namut ekama kola varigena
kara gannaṭa puluvan nam talkola iṇḍikola aragenā
kara ven eka eka vagayen toppi huṅgak sādā gena
isa lannaṭa vaṭī e Rāmaññē lakunak vilasina" 79

(If ēkapanna chatṭa can be interpreted as an umbrella made out of one single leaf, then you of Rāmañña sect might as well wear various kinds of hats made out of iṇḍi leaves or palm leaves as an emblem.⁸⁰)

These abusive accusations could not hinder the Rāmañña sect in its development. The general Buddhist public was following the footsteps of their leaders and critically analysing the situation of the bhikkhus whom

78. Āmbagahavattē was accused of not paying the duty at the Customs in Galle by Mohoṭṭivattē, and Suvannajōti was accused of stealing books from a temple and Mēdhankara for his insane activities.

79. Rāmañña Durmati Śirṣa Vidhāranaya. an unprinted manuscript.

80. Monks do not wear hats, and especially not hats of this kind.

they worshipped, and they rapidly became adherents of the Rāmañña Nikāya. This rapid and intensive growth of this sect infuriated the minds of the mahānāyaka and his Committee of the Malvatta chapter, and he issued a proclamation to the three raṭṭe mahattayās of the Tun Palāta in Pahalos Pattuva of Nuvara Kalāviya where he mentioned the supremacy of Siyam Samāgama, and referred to the Rāmañña Nikāya as 'vagabonds' (ibāgātē ā kaḍappuli samāgamak) and as 'bhikkhus who wander astray without a leader' (ibāgātē sulangē ā asvāmika Rāmañña Samāgamkārayō).⁸¹ Even these proclamations of the mahānāyaka of the Siamese sect could not prevent the Rāmañña Nikāya ^{from} being the most influential sect among the Buddhists, and when Olcott arrived in 1880, they were automatically attributed a most powerful place by the Theosophists.

Olcott and Blavatsky were received by three Fellows of the Theosophical Society who belonged to the Amarapura and Siamese sects. It is extremely interesting to note that Olcott and Blavatsky observed the Five Precepts in a temple of the Rāmañña Nikāya and the Pansil was given by a priest of the same sect.⁸² As a student

81. OR 6606 (151).

82. 'Vijayānanda Vihāra Saṭṭhaṇ Pota' says that Akmīmana Dhammārāma thera of the Rāmañña sect administered the Five Precepts.

who had read the Vinaya rules or heard of them, he may have felt that the only bhikkhus who observed the rules of Lord Buddha as he preached them are Rāmaññas and that Olcott must have witnessed the deteriorated state of the other bhikkhus when he had been associating with them. The struggling Rāmañña sect had become an important institution in society when Olcott started his Buddhist activities. Olcott expected an ideal bhikkhu society in flesh and blood around him in Ceylon. The significant character of the bhikkhu society in Ceylon is that it changes faster than the lay society. When there was no king or Sangharāja in the country the society of bhikkhus declined rapidly. Olcott was disappointed to see this situation, and he was impressed when the Rāmañña sect advocated restoring the ancient character of the bhikkhu community. He fervently believed the practices of the bhikkhus of the Rāmañña sect would completely change the deterioration of the monks. The Kāpakaru Dāyaka Sabhāva had a paramount influence on the lives of bhikkhus; they served as a body of advisers and had the power to govern the way of life of the bhikkhus. They were proficient in the Vinaya rules, since they were taught by the leaders of the sect, and one of their duties was to examine whether the bhikkhus were

observing those rules. This marked the very different attitude of the lay devotees of the Rāmañña sect towards the life of the monk from that in the other two sects. In the light of this evidence it is not surprising to witness Olcott joining hands with the Rāmañña sect with the idea of purifying the monks of the other two sects and to form the ideal bhikkhu society in the Island.

When the acquaintance of Olcott with the Buddhist monks became closer and the high priests of each sect were vying with each other to support his activities,⁸³ the 'student who came to learn Buddhism in Ceylon, sitting at the feet of the mahātheras,'⁸⁴ suffered a profound change to the plane of a religious leader accepted by the bhikkhus with the help of the Buddhist Theosophists. Olcott found himself comfortable in the midst of the Rāmañña bhikkhus who stressed the necessity of a change in the prevailing bhikkhu society.

On 3.2.1886 at the funeral gathering of Āmbagahavattē Saranankara, Colonel Olcott stressed that the essential cause for the establishment of this new sect by Saranankara, when there were already two Buddhist sects

83. The Theosophist, Vol. 1, No. 10, (July 1880), p. 253.

84. Letter written to Piyaṛatanatissa nāyaka thera on 29.8.1878 by Olcott.

in existence, was that the priests of the Amarapura and Siamese sects were merely men wearing yellow robes and he had wanted to exhibit a model of an ideal bhikkhu who has observed the ecclesiastical rules of Lord Buddha.⁸⁵ These words he pronounced in front of the lay public and the bhikkhus of the three sects. This statement shows how far he had intruded into the realm of the Buddhist church in less than six years, and it is interesting to note that not a single bhikkhu or devotee of the two sects could contradict his statement in writing or by any other medium.

At the funeral of the late leader Olcott was asked to set fire to the funeral pyre by his pupils,⁸⁶ which could not be allowed or sanctioned by the relatives of the dead. Olcott was respected inside Rāmañña Nikāya along the lines of their teacher, and in 1886 the devotees of Vijayānanda Vihāraya, Galle, actually pressed to erect statues of Olcott and Āmbagahavattē in the temple premises!⁸⁷ His acceptance as a religious leader by the bhikkhus had given him the chance to criticise the way of life of the bhikkhus in front of the public.

85. U. Suvannajōti, *Ilukvattē Mēdhankara Caritaya*, (1889), pp. 15-16.

86. H. S. Olcott, *Old Diary Leaves*, (1883-1887), Third Series, (1904), London, pp. 346-347.

87. Sarasavi Saṇḍarāsa, 16.4.1886.

When Olcott joined the ranks of ideologists of the Rāmañña sect to purify the bhikkhu community, the leaders of the Rāmañña Nikāya were launching a destructive campaign against the bhikkhus of the Siamese sect and the Amarapura sect, which developed in such a way that the social position of bhikkhus sunk to a lower level in society and the bhikkhus became an insignificant institution in the country. The campaign started with the controversy on unvirtuousness (Dussīla Vādaya) and the controversy on offering alms to the unvirtuous (Dussīla Dāna Vādaya).

At the beginning the bhikkhus of the Rāmañña sect accused the bhikkhus of the Siamese sect of unfaithfulness to the religion, and the mahānāyakas of Malvatta and Asgiriya were attacked on the superior position they held over the bhikkhus. The two boundaries were criticised as impure and anti-Buddhistic. The founder of the Rāmañña sect, being one of the victims of the controversial boundary in 1855, may have sought for an outlet to express his dissatisfaction with the activities of Siamese sect, which might have affected his thoughts in his youth. This complicated problem of the boundary was the prime cause of the disruption of the Buddhist clergy in the country. It is accepted

in Buddhist law that a 'sīmā' is the most essential factor for 'sabhāga bhikkhus' to perform higher ordination, confessions, completion of Vas and offerings of Kathina. When the bhikkhus entertained doubts on the consecrated boundaries at Kandy, the upasampadā performed at those sīmās also came under suspicion and the bhikkhus of the Siamese sect were accused by the lay devotees and the priests of the Rāmañña Nikāya as a 'group of people merely wearing yellow robes without even having higher ordination'. Though the allegation was aimed at the Siamese sect it also reached the bhikkhus of the Amarapura sect since they also had been engaged in arguments regarding the purity of a sīmā at Balapiṭṭi Mōdara for forty long years and because of the commotion created after an erection of a new sīmā at Gandara by the bhikkhus of the Mātara Nikāya,⁸⁸ a sub-section of the Amarapura sect. Subsequently the idea that there was no true upasampadā in the Amarapura and Siamese sects rapidly spread.

The critics of the Rāmañña sect accused these bhikkhus as deceivers and called them impious. This charge of Dussīla was heavily strengthened by the

88. A.L.D.A. Kurukularatna, Gandara Adāniyel Prālāpa Katura Hevat Saṅgabat Vibhāge, (1895).

behaviour of monks of these two sects, and the monks and the lay devotees of Rāmañña Nikāya secured a fine chance to prove the immorality of the bhikkhus in these sects and thereby persuade the ordinary Buddhists to be in agreement with the view of the Rāmañña Nikāya and to believe that the only monks worth the honourable title, and truly following the rules of Lord Buddha, were the priests of the Rāmañña sect. Āmbagahavattē nāyaka thera during his last days, and his dedicated disciples after 1886, were preaching against the 'holding of umbrellas, wearing fashionable squeaking slippers, covering the body with silk and expensive robes, eating beef and meat,⁸⁹ using of money, driving vehicles, and coaching pupils to drive bullock carts'.⁹⁰ The devotees of the villages vehemently criticised the unacceptable behaviour of their religious leaders in private, though in public they kept silent out of respect towards the robes, the symbol of Lord Buddha. The bhikkhus of the Siamese sect behaved in a way that could only appear repulsive to ordinary Buddhists.

89. Hanumā, Māṇsa Vāda Tīraṇaya, (1893).

90. 'sissayekuṭat gon elavuma puhunu kara
 utsaha karayi ratha nāga yāmaṭa nitara'
 'sit polāmbavana sāsasū rathayaka nāgilā
 atpolasan didi yayi gonuṭa tala talā'.
 Kāvya Sangrahava Hevat Kav Saṅgarāva, edited by W.A.M.
 Vickramasinha, Vol. 5, pp. 74-75.

'They rush around in the village in decorated bullock carts at high speed, torture the bulls when they appear to be slow and crack jokes at the pedestrians'.

Recognising the deplorable state of the bhikkhus of that time, Uḍugampola Suvannajōti of the Rāmañña Nikāya after the death of his teacher expanded the theory of the Dussīlas and a considerable contribution was added to the cause of the debate. In a religious discourse delivered on 27.8.1887, at Subōdhārāmaya, Karagampitiya, Dehivala, he stressed his belief that most of the bhikkhus who pretended to be the sons of Lord Buddha were impious men and those laymen who associated with them, who offered them foods and other eight requisites, would go to Hell. This theory was a great blow to the bhikkhus of the other sects, since lay devotees who were pleased with the activities of Rāmañña sect refrained from associating with the bhikkhus of those sects and offering foods to them.

The reply to this address emerged from a very unexpected corner, Dipadutt^{mā}āramaya at Koṭahēna . Migetṭuvattē Gunānanda sāmanēra (also called Mohoṭṭivattē, 9.2.1822- 21.9.1890) compiled 'Dussīla Dāna Vibhāgaya, or the religious rules regarding alms according to Buddhism, and the standard of the pseudo-religious leaders of the Rāmañña sect' in 1887. He accused the

bhikkhus of the Rāmañña sect of being a ' group of people wearing yellow robes to deceive innocent Buddhists' and he turned their allegations in the other direction and argued ' those who associate with the bhikkhus of Rāmañña Nikāya and who offer alms to them will acquire demerits and will definitely be born in Hell', and he declared that ' the birth of Rāmañña Nikāya two thousand four hundred years after the Passing away of Buddha is a symptom of the decline of the Sāsana'.⁹¹ He maintained the validity of the Siamese sect and the Amarapura sect as legally established religious institutions in the Island and accused the leader of the Rāmañña sect of not even being a bhikkhu, as he had left Burma two years after his upasampadā without observing Nisa for five years at the feet of his upādhyāya- and he named him as a 'rogue' who did not declare his smuggled expensive silk clothes at the Customs office in Galle harbour. That by the employment of such a privilege he had lost his priesthood was the other allegation made against him.⁹²

91. M. Gunānanda, Dussīla Dāna Vibhāgaya Hevat Dandīma Gāna Buddha Dharmayē Niyama Kara Tibena Andama Saha Rāmañña Nikāyika Sramāṇa Pratirūpakayangē Samāgamē Paramānaya, (1887), p.8.

92. *ibid*, pp.9-14.

The theory propounded by Migeṭṭuvattē of the Amarapura sect in regard to alms to impious bhikkhus is hardly any different from the views expressed by an anonymous monk at Malvatta, in his 'Dāna Vibhāgaya' as the outcry of the Siamese sect. 'The unawareness of the devotees of the impious state of the receiver of alms will enable him to gain merits, while the knowledge of such unvirtuousness only paves for the giver the way to the Hell! In connection with this rather dishonest statement, one could without doubt surmise that the whole community of lay devotees were aware of the affairs of these two sects in those days. Even if a bhikkhu's engagement in an immoral act does not come under serious protest from Buddhists they will disapprove of it. This sober attitude of the devotees might have been understood by the priests of both sects, which led them to conclude that the villagers were ignorant of their subversive activities. Migeṭṭuvattē too misjudged the silence of Buddhists as an approval of their unvirtuous lives. He was a sāmanera who had succumbed to degradation for his incessant amorous advances to the fair sex, but was highly respected by the Buddhists as their foremost religious leader. Kolōmba Sobhita ⁹³ (a sāmanera)

93. Popularly known as Koratōṭa Sōbhita.

was the accepted militant leader of the Buddhist movement against the activities of the Christians, but he was also the owner of the best racing bull and the most gorgeously decorated bullock cart in the Colombo area.⁹⁴ Migeṭṭuvattē's theory was therefore of no help in the debate.

Migeṭṭuvattē's treatise was hardly unnoticed by the critics of the rival group and the reply 'Dussīla Dāna Viniścaya; the purity of the Rāmañña sect and the inaccuracies of Mohoṭṭivattē's theory' appeared in the same year.⁹⁵ 'The unscrupulous Mohoṭṭivattē of Amarapura sect', accused the author of the book, 'by his anamadversions has discredited the sincere efforts of the authors of two descriptive historical works of Amarapura Nikāya,⁹⁶ is an 'ambidextor' and his intention is to exaggerate the position of the Siamese sect'. So said the critics; and the same author at the end of his book summed up the state of the bhikkhus of these sects in a single sentence and asked Migeṭṭuvattē whether the Buddhists of this country are ignorant of the lives of such bhikkhus ' who feel lonely in the sēnāsanas, go to houses at any time, do various

94.V.D.De Lānerolle, Hapankam Mōḍakam Saha Purasāram, (1959), p.173.

95.'Dussīla Dāna Viniścaya Saha Rāmañña Nikāya Nirdōṣa Bavat Śramana Dussīla Upasthānayan Vana Avāḍat Dākvīma Hevat Mohoṭṭivattē Gunānanda Unnānsē Kala Dussīla Dāna Vibhāgaya Nam Potehi Dākvū Boru Heli Kirīma'.

96.Mramma Vamsa Viniścaya and Sāsana Dīpa (1880).

transactions with laymen, read horoscopes, offer foods to the spirits, buy lands, cattle, houses and fields for their personal use, go to courts of Justice, engage in business and collect money from laymen without even observing the Five Precepts'.⁹⁷

In the course of the unexpected growth of the Rāmañña Nikāya there were certainly serious criticisms against the sect and in 1888, Johānnas Pieris of Alutgama started the weekly paper 'Heladiv Ruvana' of the Bauddha Prakāśa Samāgama to propagate the views of the sect.⁹⁸ 'As the editorial mentions that the aim of the paper is to protect Buddhism', Migeṭṭuvattē, the most outspoken critic of the activities of the Rāmañña sect stated in his paper, ' I hope that they will avail themselves of the help at my disposal to combat the Theosophists to safeguard Buddhism'.⁹⁹ This statement looks cynical when one recollects the hostility of Migeṭṭuvattē towards the Rāmañña sect, and it is incredible to witness the friendship between the followers of the Rāmañña sect and their critic Migeṭṭuvattē against the Theosophists, who had accepted the position of

97.Dussīla Dāna Viniścaya, p.22.

98.Copies of this paper are available at Śrī Prañāsēkhara Library, Navagamuva, Ceylon.

99.Rivirāsa, edited by M.Gunānanda, 21.10.1888.

bhikkhus of the Rāmañña sect as most superior in virtue. Sarasavi Saṅdarāsa accurately knew the lack of support for Migeṭṭuvattē, the former Theosophist, from the Rāmañña Nikāya, and received the paper with gratitude¹⁰⁰ while the existing Buddhist paper Lakminipahana thought differently. 'There were and are so many Buddhist societies who have professed to be guardians of religion. Why do not they unite themselves? This is the dilemma'.¹⁰¹ The life span of the paper was not more than ten months and on 24.9.1888 the press was sold and the report of its 'death' in 'Lakminipahana' clearly shows the feelings of the opponents on the activities of Rāmañña Nikāya.

"There is nothing to feel sorry about. This death occurs as a result of the bad horoscope of the child (ariṣṭha yōgaya), where there is Rāhu in the fifth house, and Vāgīśvara the Saturn in the eighth house and Suvannajōti the Kētu in the twelfth house. The child was out of his senses and ludicrously insulted the great ones, Nāgasēna, Milinda and the Commentators including the author of Milinda Praśnaya'.¹⁰²

Though the propagandist literature of the Rāmañña Nikāya did not enjoy a long spell of life, its influence on the way of thinking of Buddhist society was enormous in the religious history of the Island. The only bhikkhu who defended the Siamese and Amarapura sects had another

100. Sarasavi Saṅdarāsa, edited by T. Karunāratna, 27.9.1888.
 101. Lakminipahana, edited by M. Dharmaratna, 20.10.1888.
 102. Lakminipahana, 27.9.1888.

serious problem to face after 8.1.1888. Migeṭṭuvattē started his newspaper 'Rivirāsa' and launched a strong campaign against the activities of the Theosophists; thus the Siamese and Amarapura sects finally lost their sympathizer. In the coming decade the bhikkhus of these sects were inexhaustibly criticised by the lay devotees, most of whom became admirers of the Rāmañña sect. While Dussīla Vādaya dropped its sub-controversy on alms, it raised its head intermittently for a long period and became heated again when H.L.Adiriyan Appuhāmy contributed an article to Lakminipahana. This article was commented on by the editor of the paper and an editorial was appended on the same subject. Two pamphlets were issued by the Siamese sect against these writings. In one of them, composed by M.David Appuhāmy of Paṭṭivala on 17.10.1894, attempts were made to justify the Siamese sect without substantiating facts, using the most abusive language and addressing the bhikkhus and the followers of Rāmañña Nikāya as Roḍiyō (outcasts) Hiṅgannō (beggars) and Nīcayō (menials).¹⁰³ A movement was formed to sign a document and swear to refrain from giving alms to the bhikkhus of the Siamese sect and the Amarapura sect as a reaction to this pamphlet.¹⁰⁴

103.M.David Appuhāmy, Dussīla Mardhanaya, (1894), p.2.

104. ibid, p.8.

Even at that time traces of Dussīla Vādāya were to be seen. The critics from Rāmañña Nikāya accused the bhikkhus 'who carry umbrellas' and maintained that an umbrella made out of cloth can not be a 'Chattam'. Vaidya Śāstrālankārāya published an article of M. David Appuhāmy together with an editorial and a person called 'A.P.S.' distributed another pamphlet entitled 'Dussīla Dānōpasthānaya Saha H.L.A.'. At a later date a priest from up-country joined the critics of the Rāmañña sect after publishing a book which he called 'Saddharmādāsaya'. Eventually a reply to all these compilations appeared in 1895, 'Dussīla Mardanaya Hā Bauddha Mārgaya', a work of propaganda for the Rāmañña sect where the author accused those bhikkhus who read horoscopes for money, who engaged in medical treatment to laymen, and those bhikkhus who had spouses of their own, and did not forget to mention the friendship of the author of Saddharmādāsaya with a Tamil woman.¹⁰⁵

In the decade prior to 1892 the controversy on the impious and the alms to impious had remained active and the bhikkhus of the affected sects had become the target of criticisms by laymen. The religious debates conducted after 1890 indicate the culmination of the expected participation of lay devotees in religious affairs.

105. M. David Appuhāmy, op.cit, p.27.

The lay devotees had been the audience at the controversies where bhikkhus participated, and this was the prevalent system. It was dramatically altered by the activities of the Rāmañña Nikāya, and laymen reached the plane of ideologists and protagonists in the religious controversies. Baṭapatē Vādaya (1892), Aṅgurvāllē Vādaya (1892), Dāna Vādaya (1891), Kaḍakāti Vādaya (1891),¹⁰⁶ Viṣṇu Vādaya (1891) and Banku Vādaya (1907) are clear evidence of the domination of lay devotees in place of bhikkhus regarding religious matters.

When the bhikkhus of Rāmañña Nikāya were delivering lectures on offerings to the impious in and around the village of Baṭapata, near Uḍugampola in Alutkuru Kōralē, the birthplace of Suvannajōti, a leading member of Rāmañña sect, they read some parts of a treatise called 'Dussīla Sangraha Bhēdaya'. These discourses were powerful enough to impress the minds of most of the villagers, and Babā Siññō, a villager, after listening to the sermons made a comparison of the lives of the bhikkhus of each sect and started a campaign against the bhikkhus of Baṭapatē Vihāraya, a temple of the Siamese sect, challenging the priests to prove their suitability

106. Sometimes known as Vā Vādaya. The priests were using a cut-throat razor (dāli pihiya) in those days. Leaders of the Rāmañña sect held that the term Vāsi in Pali corresponds to vāya (adze) in Sinhalese and advocated the use of an adze while the Siamese sect argued for the use of the razor.

to accept the offerings of the lay devotees before he stopped his public criticisms. He accused the impious bhikkhus at some places where bhikkhus of the Siamese sect were invited to deliver sermons, and at last, witnessing the silence of Baṭapatē Vihārāya, he challenged the priests to a debate without any conditions. ¹⁰⁷

It was the twentyninth day of August 1892. The time was two P.M. The bells were rung. In the decorated sermon hall at Baṭapatē Vihārāya the debate was to be held. Uḍugampola Suvannajōti was present but the representative speaker of the Rāmañña Nikāya against Bādigama Ratanapāla of the Siamese sect was P.A.Pieris, a lay devotee of the sect. The apple of discord was thus stated by the leader of the Rāmañña sect.

"sil nāti mahanahu sēvana bajanā sahitavat	ohuṭa
siv pasa uvaṭān karanā dan dena aya yati	avayaṭa
sil nāti mut ohuma singā soyā pāmini kala	gedaraṭa'.
"nodīmenut vitarana kaḍa veyi yana adahasi	nā
yadī lesin salakā diyayutu veyi yana adahasi	nā
sādī asun panavā induvā vāṇḍa piduvoti	nā
edīmenut akusalmaya vāḍak nātāyi	kiya
	nā". ¹⁰⁸

107. S.L.Ferera, Rāmañña Vāda Bhangaya, (1892), verses 2-6, p.1.

108. ibid,

(The association with and offering of foods and three other necessities to the impious, will enable the devotees only to go^{to} Hell. But when an impious bhikkhu visits the home, if one thinks of courtesy give him something as a beggar, but not as a priest, or you gain demerits. You must not prepare comfortable seats for him nor pay homage to him.)

Both parties were given the chance to answer to eight queries raised by each side. Bādigama Ratanapāla's contention has a slight difference.

"kopamana guna nāti pavīṭek haṭavat pin salakā dan dena

tānādī

apamana duk dena akusal mul tunaṭama saturuva pinsita

upadī

ipaduna ē pinsita koyi lesakinvat duk dēdāyi paralovadī

...."

(When one offers something to somebody the germ of merit is born in one's mind. The qualities of the receiver do not count. Merits make the man prosperous in his next birth.)

After the controversy P.A.Pieris compiled the proceedings of the debate and illustrated the theory of the Rāmañña sect under^{the} title 'An analysis of taking refuge in the impious bhikkhus' (Śramana Dussīla Saranāgamana Vibhāgaya). A book refuting the statements of this treatise of Pieris was printed by S.L.P, an ardent admirer of Bādigama Ratanapāla, entitled 'Rāmañña Vāda

Bhangaya' in 1892 and was reprinted in 1895.

Aṅgurvāllē Vādaya is a result of the superficial knowledge secured by the lay devotees by participation in the religious activities of the Rāmañña Nikāya.

'Whether the Vinaya rules should be taught to laymen' was the theme of the debate, and it had a considerable effect in some parts of the Island. The debators belonged to the Siamese sect and Rāmañña sect.

Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala nāyaka thera of the Siamese sect had issued a proclamation to the bhikkhus of his sect to debar them from preaching sermons to laymen on ecclesiastical law, and the bhikkhus of Rāmañña Nikāya were against the view. The lay devotees of Valallāviṭi Kōralē, Bentara, after the erection of a new sermon hall at Aṅgurvālla, to commemorate the occasion for three weeks with religious festivals invited the priests of the neighbouring temples irrespective of their sects to preach Vinaya, and the bhikkhus of Galapāta Vihāraya, a temple of Siamese sect, accepted the invitation on 24.4.1892. Later, on the second day of May they declined the invitation on the grounds that Vinaya is only for bhikkhus who have received their upasampadā. The organisers of the festival intended to have sermons on Vinaya Piṭaka and Sūtra Piṭaka in the first two weeks

and a Pirit chanting ceremony in the third. The refusal caused a great ferment among the lay devotees and on fourth May the bhikkhus of Galapāta Vihāraya reinstated their acceptance to preach Bana on Vinaya. By that time the adherents of Rāmañña Nikāya were active on the dissension and at a meeting of devotees Yālēgama Agōnis, a carpenter by profession, raised doubts on the real intentions of the bhikkhus of Galapāta Vihāraya, and declared his ability to supply bhikkhus from the temple of the Rāmañña sect to preach on Vinaya. He warned the organisers of the advice of Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala and discussed the steps that should be taken if he disapproved of the participation. Ratanapāla thera of Galapāta Vihāraya accepted the challenge and went to seek permission from Sumangala. Unfortunately he could not secure permission. Thus Ratanapāla thera was unable to supply bhikkhus as he had promised, while Gorakadūvē Atthadassi of the Rāmañña sect publicly declared his idea on Vinaya, namely that it is openly accesible to laymen. 'Buddhism is open to laymen as the sun and the moon' was his slogan. The lay organisers after this cancelled all the other former invitations and sought the help of Rāmañña Nikāya to pursue their festival. Sirisumanatissa thera of Jayasumanārāmaya, Yālagama and twentyfive other bhikkhus of Rāmañña Nikāya delivered

lectures on Vinaya and Sūtra and in the third week chanted Pirit.

Meanwhile the bhikkhus of the Siamese sect, it was believed, were making attempts to sabotage the festival. Petitions were submitted to the government authorities and every day the Mudliar visited the temple enquiring from the devotees about possible riots at the temple. Punci Siññō Appuhāmy of Gurukanda with fifty other bhikkhus of the Siamese sect on a festival day invaded the temple and read a letter of Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala addressed to the lay devotees advising them not to take part in the un-Buddhistic festival, since the rules of Vinaya were only for the upasampadā-bhikkhu. This originated the controversy at Aṅguruvālla.¹⁰⁹

The lay speakers of the Rāmañña Nikāya attempted to prove the correctness of the statement 'Tathāgatappavedito bhikkhave dhammavinayo vivaṭo virocāti no paṭicchanno' while the leaders of the Siamese sect advocated along the lines of 'Pātimokkhuḍdeso kevalam ca vinayapiṭakam pihitam paṭicchannam'. After the debate the leading lay devotee of the Rāmañña sect, P.A.Pieris, wrote 'Vinaya Apaṭicchanna Bhāva Viniścaya' in 1892.

This dominance of lay devotees in religious affairs not only caused the gradual decline of the status of the

¹⁰⁹.P.A.Pieris, Vinaya Apaṭicchanna Bhāva Viniścaya, (1892).
P.A.Pieris, Pānadurē Abhinava Vāda Pota, (1892).

bhikkhu in the sāsana but created a confusion of thought regarding the superior position of bhikkhus, as clearly shown in Banku Vādaya (controversy on seats). All the participants were lay devotees. The bhikkhu normally sits on a comfortable chair while preaching and this seat is called 'Dharmāsana', and the listeners sit on mats spread on the floor. Laymen sometimes found it physically difficult to sit on the hard surface but the superstitions of the Sinhalese on the pillow would not allow them to sit on a cushion. The idea of equality had been emerging for the last two decades, and G.M. Aponsu, a native physician, argued against this new theory of sitting on chairs and desks and interpreted 'nīcāsana' as the mat. In Banku Vādaya Vibhāgaya, D.M. Silva discussed the validity of a desk as 'nīcāsana' when compared to the comfortable Dharmāsana of the bhikkhu. That the paramount power has been gained by the lay devotees in religious affairs, while the bhikkhus have lost their revered position in religion is clear when one examines the role played by the bhikkhus in this controversy in 1908. Five distinguished and eminent bhikkhus of the Siamese sect and Amarapura sects who opposed the idea of sitting on chairs and desks at sermons held at the B.T.S headquarters, issued a circular abandoning their earlier theory.¹¹⁰

110. Silumina, edited by W.F. Gunavardhana, (February 1909), pp. 380-383.

All of these religious controversies were the consequences of the unforeseen growth of Rāmañña Nikāya against the feeble, decadent Siamese and Amarapura sects. The most significant factor in its development was the much acclaimed unity among its bhikkhus. After the death of their founder mahānāyaka thera, the bhikkhus met at Dūvē Vihāraya, Payāgala, on 5.2.1886 with Bādīgama Dhammānanda thera, chief incumbent of the Gāmamaṇḍapārāmaya, Gammaḍuva, and to continue the pure cause of their leader they appointed a ten-member committee of eminent bhikkhus (Dasa Vārgika Kāraka Sangha Sabhāva) and the eldest of the ten was elected as the permanent president of the committee who automatically became the mahānāyaka thera of the sect.¹¹¹ This establishment was very sound and it supplied a strong foundation for the unity of the sect in the future. The leaders of the Rāmañña sect had had the experience of witnessing the disruption of the other sects due to petty personal problems and sensibly considered the humane feelings of the dedicated bhikkhus who had rendered great service in its activities for the last few years and elected some of them to the committee though they were not 'ten years of age'.¹¹² Thus

111. Śrī Vimalānanda Mahānāyaka Caritaya, p.48.

112. The age of a monk is counted only after his higher ordination.

Dīpēgoḍa Siri Saddhammavara Jotipāla Sīlakkhandha thera (- 3.6.1916) was appointed mahānāyaka and continued in that capacity during the period under discussion. He prepared a Code of Rules for the bhikkhus on 6.2.1887 and subsequently altered it and prepared a second Code of Rules in 1892.¹¹³

In accordance with emerging events and the impinging of various social forces the leaders of the Nikāya acted firmly, promptly and with foresight. When they were aware of someone's ability they recognised his talents and appointed him to the Committee, and in 1891 the number on the Committee was thirteen and it was called 'Terasa Vārgika Kāraka Sangha Sabhāva'.¹¹⁴ At times there occurred various personal problems to be solved, and this thirteen-member committee of monks handled those precarious situations with great success. The bhikkhus who gathered at Bōdhirājēndrārāmaya, Niṭṭaṃbuva,¹¹⁵ appointed three bhikkhus of the Committee as provincial chiefs, but some bhikkhus resented the appointment. When the holders of those appointments, made on 28.1.1903, were cognizant of the opposition they patiently tendered their

113. Śrī Lankā Rāmañña Nikāyē Katikāvata, (1950), pp. 29-31.

114. This selective meeting was held at Abhayakarunārātnārā-maya, Vālipiṭṭiya, Pānadura in the month of December 1891. (Śrī Vimalānanda Caritaya, p. 51) But Aggadhammālankāra Caritaya, p. 5 states the year as 1892.

115. Now known as Vidyānanda Pirivena, Niṭṭaṃbuva.

resignation on 17.3.1903, considering only the future of the sect.

By this time the Kāpakaru Dāyaka Sabhās wielded an immense influence on religious affairs and in the lives of the bhikkhus, and had formed a 'Śrī Sugata Śāsanōpakāra Sabhā',¹¹⁶ with eight hundred members to discuss the procedure bhikkhus should adopt in the selection of bhikkhus to the Committee, participation in judicial affairs and handling of money.

With the formation of Śrī Sugata Śāsanōpakāra Sabhā on 30.9.1908, the desired status of the participation in religious matters by laymen had been accomplished. At the beginning of the twentieth century Rāmañña Nikāya entered the position of a powerful force in the religious history of the country. The simultaneous deterioration of the bhikkhus of Amarapura and Siamese sects made them inactive in religion, and the energy and enthusiasm they had expended on the problem of Sīmā seem to have been lost in the subsequent three decades. We need mention only two further happenings in these two sects, though the literature written on the events is scanty.

After the foundation of Kālaṇi Nikāya in 1856, the three different chapters of the Siamese sect continued

¹¹⁶. Some times known as Tun Kōralē Sabhāva.

to hold their higher ordination ceremonies separately till 1893, when the Kālaṇi Chapter which had conferred upasampadā on three hundred and sixty four novices during the past thirteen years ¹¹⁷ made arrangements to hold the ceremony at the Baddha Sīmā of Raja Mahā Vihāraya at Kōṭṭe. On 30.5.1893 the mahātheras agreed to this resolution, but the foremost members of the chapter, Mullēriyāvē Sirinivāsa mahāsthavira, Mullēriyāvē Gunarathana mahāthera, Valānē Dhammānanda mahāthera, Kaṭuvāvala Sirisumanatissa mahāthera, Uḍugampola Indasāra mahāthera and Agalavattē Medhankara mahāthera denounced the decision and on 29.4.1894 determined that the Kālaṇi chapter should continue conferring the higher ordination at the Kālaṇi river. ¹¹⁸

The year 1894 marked the only activity in the Siamese sect after a period of silence. Potuvila Indajoti mahāthera, Mullēriyāvē Ānanda mahāthera of Ganēgoḍālla temple, Baddēgama Saranankara mahāthera of Śrī Mahā Vihāraya, Bōgoḍa Dhammakitti mahāthera of Kōṭṭāva temple and Nāvala Siddhattha mahāthera of Nāvala Vihāraya on 31.5.1894 performed the upasampadā ceremony at Kōṭṭe Raja Mahā Vihāraya, and founded a new chapter in the Siamese sect, called 'Kōṭṭe chapter'. Those mahātheras who had

117. Kōṭṭe Sangha Sabhāva, compiled by Labugama Lankānanda, (1964), p.31.

118. Letter written on 30.4.1894 now at Molligoḍa Pirivena, in the possession of Labugama Lankānanda nāyaka therā.

renounced the decision to have the ceremony at Kōṭṭē, conducted the upasampadā ceremony at Āmbatalē ferry in the month of June 1894 and continued the Kālaṇi Chapter.¹¹⁹ Valānē Śrī Dhammānanda was appointed mahānāyaka in the Kālaṇi Chapter, and Potuvila Indajoti was the mahānāyaka of the Kōṭṭē Chapter.¹²⁰

While this disintegration occurred in Siyam Nikāya, the Amarapura sect also saw the birth of a new sub-sect, in 1901. Paññābhi Siridhamma Kavidhaja Mahādhamma Rājādhirājaguru Vajirārāma mahāthera of Burma, who visited the Island with Burmese pilgrims, on his return compiled 'Dussīla Dānādi Vinicchaya' in 1892 and its printed copies in Burmese characters were sent to the bhikkhus in Ceylon, and translated into Sinhalese. If the available translations of 'Dussīla Dānādi Viniścaya' could be considered as an authentic translation of the original we can deduce that this was written to criticise the views of the Amarapura and Siamese sects while extolling the ideas of Rāmañña Nikāya. Vajirārāma mahāsthavira discussed the problems of giving alms to the impious with or without the knowledge of their qualities, the appropriateness of teaching ecclesiastical rules to
^{119.}I am grateful to Halgastoṭa Devānanda anunāyaka sthavira, of this sect for the information.

^{120.}This is the accepted idea, but Labugama nāyaka thera told me Potuvila was the leader of the movement but differences of opinion did not allow him to be the mahānāyaka. Āmbulgama Vimalakittitissa was the mahānāyaka from 1898- 1920.

the laymen, holding the umbrella and the usage of the alms bowl. His theories regarding these problems were identical with the views of Rāmañña sect and very critical of the attitudes of the bhikkhus of the other two sects. This book made an impact on free-thinking bhikkhus of the Amarapura sect, and when Vajirārāma mahāthera visited the country in 1901, Salamaldeniyē Gunānanda and his followers received the upasampadā from him and founded the Amarapura Vajirārāma Nikāya.

In the light of this evidence we can conclude that the lack of certainty among bhikkhus regarding the theory of the Consecrated boundary (Sīmā), the most essential factor for the confirmation of upasampadā to novices, led to the disruption of the Siamese sect from 1826 and the Amarapura sect from 1851, and the controversy on the impious and the controversy on alms to the impious, originating with the seemingly radical attitude of Rāmañña Nikāya, concurrently aggravated the position of bhikkhus in society. The idea of lay participation in religion and in controlling the lives of bhikkhus as conceded by the leader of the rapidly growing Rāmañña sect accelerated the deterioration of the bhikkhus of Siamese and Amarapura sects. The paramount dominance of lay devotees in religion seriously damaged the social and religious leadership of the bhikkhu and thereby paved the way for the emergence of a lay advisorship and leadership in religion in the place of the bhikkhu.

Chapter two

THE RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES OF THE LAITY

At the end of the preceding chapter we touched on an important event; the institutional acceptance of the lay devotees into the religion, which appeared with the development of the Rāmañña sect. This significant participation in religious affairs is a landmark in the history of Buddhism in the Island and it signified a period of transition in the leadership and function of the Buddhist priests in both religious and social activities, after the arrival of the Theosophists in 1880.

Sixteen years after the birth of the Rāmañña sect, on the seventeenth of May 1880, Colonel Henry Steel Olcott and Madame Helena Petrovna Blavatsky arrived in Galle.¹ Olcott after reading the account of Dr.J.M. Peebles on the controversy at Panadura between Buddhist priests and Wesleyan ministers,² corresponded with Migeṭṭuvattē Gunānanda Sāmanera who submitted the names

1.H.S.Olcott,Old Diary Leaves,Second Series,(1878-1883), London, 1900,p.158.

The Theosophist,edited by H.P.Blavatsky,Vol.1,No.9, June 1880,Bombay, p.240.

2.J.M.Peebles, The Great Debate-Buddhism and Christianity Face to Face,(Second edition),1955,Colombo. The controversy which was carried on in Sinhalese was translated into English and printed by John Capper in 1873 and this book was reprinted by Peebles at Boston and London.

of Hikkāḍuvē Sumangala nāyaka thera and Doḍandūvē Piyaratana nāyaka thera to him as the most authoritative scholars of Buddhism.³ Sumangala nāyaka thera, a renowned scholar of the Siamese sect, 'the senior Buddhist member of the General Council of the Theosophical Society in New York' who made one of the first Ceylonese contributions to the Theosophist,⁴ was appointed vice-president of the Society for the years 1880 and 1881.⁵ Doḍandūvē Piyaratana nāyaka thera, the founder of the Amarapura Kalyāṇivamsa sect, a contributor to the Theosophist,⁶ was appointed Fellow of the Society in 1878.⁷ Bulatgama Sirisumanatissa nāyaka thera of Paramānanda Vihāra, Minuvangoḍa, Galle, of the Amarapura sect with his disciples anxiously awaited the arrival of the Theosophists 'as a swarm (sic) of peacocks joyously long for the downpour of a shower'.⁸ Migeṭṭuvattē

3. Undated letter of Mohoṭṭivatte now lying at Śailabimbārāma, Doḍandūva.

4. The Theosophist, Vol. 1, No. 1, (October 1879), p. 32.
H. Sumangala, 'The Nature and Office of Buddha's Religion',
The Theosophist, Vol. 1, No. 2, (November 1879), p. 43.

5. Supplement to The Theosophist, Vol. 1, No. 8, (May 1880), p. 214.
Supplement to The Theosophist, Vol. ii, No. 9, (June 1881), p. 206.

6. D. P. T., 'Real Buddhism - Kamma', The Theosophist, Vol. 1, No. 8, (May 1880), p. 199.

7. Appointment letter dated 29.8.1878 (Śailabimbārāmaya).

8. The Theosophist, Vol. 1, No. 2, (November 1879), p. 34.

Gunānanda of the Amarapura sect, the first unseen Buddhist friend of Olcott, one of the General Councillors of the Society,⁹ had been organising a branch of the Society in Ceylon expecting the Founders' arrival,¹⁰ and had translated some passages on the miraculous deeds of Blavatsky described in her 'Isis Unveiled' and distributed those pamphlets among the Buddhists to introduce the Theosophists, giving them publicity in advance.¹¹ These four bhikkhus of the Siamese and Amarapura sects were so active that in six months' time twenty names were added to the subscription list of the Theosophist from Ceylon.¹² Finally Gunānanda Sāmanera informed the anxious Buddhists of the arrival of the 'white friend of the Buddhists'. They, the leaders of the Siamese and Amarapura sects, have invited Olcott and Blavatsky to Ceylon; Mohoṭṭivattē made all the necessary arrangements to receive them¹³ and they were entertained royally by the Buddhists.¹⁴

9. The Theosophist, Vol. 1, No. 8, (May 1880), p. 214.

10. The Theosophical Society, (Bombay) 1879, p. 2.

11. H. S. Olcott, op. cit, p. 157.

Anagārika Dharmapāla, 'Memories of an Interpreter of Buddhism to the Present-Day World', Return to Righteousness, edited by Ananda Guruge, 1965, p. 685.

12. The Theosophist, Vol. 1, No. 7, (April 1880), p. 192.

13. idem, p. 157.

14. idem, p. 685.

Olcott in no time realised the 'internal questions of a theological or doctrinal nature' among the priests and announced that the Theosophical Society would not permit itself to be an organ for forcing these family differences upon the public attention.¹⁵ His brief association with the monks though it lasted only for a week enabled him to change sides completely; he instinctively realised the most unsatisfactory situation of the bhikkhus and to the overwhelming surprise of everyone Olcott and Blavatsky took the Five Precepts as Buddhists at Vijayānanda Vihāraya, Vālivatta, Galle, a temple of the Rāmañña Nikāya,¹⁶ on twentyfifth of May 1880; the religious rites were conducted by Akmiṃana Dhammārāma therā¹⁷ of the same sect.

15. Pioneer, June 1880. Reproduced in The Theosophist, Vol. 1, No. 10, (July 1880), p. 259.

16. Vijayānanda Vihāra Saṭṭahan Pota, (an unpublished manuscript)

17. Dhammārāma therā was the chief incumbent of the temple. But this is a matter of contention. Some documents at Śailabimbārāmaya, Doḍandūva, refer to Piyaratana nāyaka therā as the administrator of the Precepts while Olcott attributed it to Bulatgama nāyaka therā. (op. cit, p. 167). Bulatgama being the chief incumbent of an Amarapura temple his selection at a temple of the Rāmañña sect is incredible. As Vihāra Saṭṭahan Pota is a contemporary document its statement may be taken as authentic. If Bulatgama had administered the Precepts why did the editor of The Buddhist not mention that significant fact when he wrote on Bulatgama's death in The Buddhist, Vol. iii, No. 37, (4.9.1891), pp. 292-293. C. Jinarajadasa, in The Golden Book of The Theosophical Society, (1925), mentions the date of taking Precepts as 25.5.1880 (p. 220) and reproduces a mysterious certificate issued by Olcott written on 19.5.1880. (p. 50).

The three nāyaka theras who were present at this significant festival, Sumangala nāyaka thera, Piyyaratana nāyaka thera, Fellows of the Society, and Bulatgama nāyaka thera an enthusiastic supporter of the Society, were beyond doubt religiously recognised as the Elders of the meeting but were not accepted by the Theosophists as bhikkhus pious enough to administer the Five Precepts to them. The accepted tradition among the Sangha community would definitely not allow any other priest to perform the religious duties at this ceremony except the three nāyaka theras whom we have mentioned earlier.¹⁸ In neglecting the religious convention Olcott must have thought that these nāyaka theras of the Siamese and the Amarapura sects were merely his friends, but that the bhikkhus of Rāmañña Nikāya were more suitable to conduct the ceremony since they were the ideal followers of Lord Buddha.

Olcott by his intimacy with the Rāmañña Nikāya at his public profession exhibits the primary signs of a dissatisfaction towards the activities of the other two sects, and that was only the beginning of a long process. The unexpected inferiority demonstrated by

18. In 1880, Bulatgama was 81 years old, Piyyaratana was 54, Sumangala was 53 while Dhammārāma was approximately 50. If Bulatgama had not delivered the Precepts because he was old, it might have fallen to the next two persons.

the high priests of the Siamese sect intensified Olcott's discontent. The mahanayakas of Malvatta and Asgiriya chapters paid a visit to Olcott on 10.6.1880¹⁹ although he had not visited them, 'complained bitterly of their official impotence to restore order and discipline'²⁰ among the bhikkhus and arranged a special exhibition of the Tooth of Lord Buddha to the visitors,²¹ both of whom at a later stage ridiculed the precious Relic of the Buddhists of Ceylon as 'a tooth the size of an alligator'²² 'made out of a deer's horn'²³ or an elk's horn²⁴ and as a 'tooth of a tiger'.²⁵

After enjoying the hospitality of the mahānāyakas and other monks at the Town Hall in Kandy, on 11.6.1880, in front of those recognised high priests and the lay devotees the Theosophists publicly criticised the lives of Buddhist monks of both the sects and without understanding the subtle complexities accused the laymen of 'fostering sects' and alleged the monks to be a group of 'ignorant, idle fosterers of superstitions'.²⁶

19.H.S.Olcott, op.cit, p.180.

20.H.S.Olcott, Old Diary Leaves, Sixth Series (April 1896-September 1898), 1935, Madras, p.154.

21.The Theosophist, Vol.1, No.10, (July 1880), p.260.

22.idem, p.164.

23.ibid, p.165.

24.Sinhala Baudhayā, edited by Anagārika Dharmapāla, 19.5.1906.

25.H.S.Olcott, Old Diary Leaves, Second Series, p.186.

26.H.S.Olcott, The Life of Buddha and its Lessons, lecture delivered at Kandy Town Hall, 1880, p.11.

When the Buddhist Theosophical Society was founded in Colombo all the official posts in it were meant for laymen only, either administrators or wealthy merchants, businessmen and landowners. Sumangala nāyaka thera the vice-president of the mother society in New York and Piyaratana nāyaka thera and Gunānanda Sāmanera, General Councillors of the same, were deprived of their positions when the B.T.S was formed in their own country, and not a single bhikkhu of the Island was offered even the capacity of an advisor in any of the branches throughout the country, though the monks had helped the Society towards its initial success. The priests of the Island for the first time lost their identity as patrons of religious activities with the formation of the B.T.S in Colombo and its seven branches ²⁷ during the eight weeks ²⁸ spent in Ceylon by Olcott.

He also formed an 'Ecclesiastical Council' exclusively for Buddhist priests, ²⁹ but it never functioned

27. Colombo Buddhist Theosophical Society (8.6.1880)

Kandy Theosophical Society (13.6.1880)

Pānadurē Theosophical Society (20.6.1880)

Bentoṭa Theosophical Society (23.6.1880)

Vālitara Theosophical Society (10.7.1880)

Mātara Theosophical Society (28.6.1880)

Galle Theosophical Society (25.5.1880)

Lankā Theosophical Society (17.6.1880)

The Theosophist, Vol.1, No.11, (August 1880), pp.262-263.

28. The Theosophists were in Ceylon from 17.5.1880 to 13.7.1880.

29. The Theosophist, Vol.1, No.12, (September 1880), p.292.

successfully.³⁰ When one considers this isolation in its social context it has to be considered as a great change in the religious and social history of the country. The change of the inquisitive student interested in Buddhism into a superficial critic of the prevalent religious behaviour arouses the attention of the student of religious history. During his lifetime Olcott witnessed the disastrous consequences of his activities, and at that stage to prove his innocence he wrote an explanatory note on his dissociation of priests from the activities of the Society. However this exculpatory note distinctly exhibits his hypocrisy. In regard to the separation of the monks from the laymen he says that the 'ordination rules of Vinaya forbid a monk to be associated on equal terms with laymen in worldly affairs'.³¹ If we are to accept that his adherence to the Vinaya law forced him to separate the priests from the laymen, then what puzzles our mind is his general attitude to those rules. Even a random look on the activities of Olcott's eight week stay in the country will prove his deliberate neglect of that 'Vinaya rule'. If he was such an ardent follower of that peculiar Vinaya rule one can pose a

30. Unfortunately we have no reports on the activities of this Council.

31. H.S. Olcott, ODL Second Series, p. 179.

question regarding his selection of Sumangala, Piyaratana and Migeṭṭuvattē as executive members of the Theosophical Society in 1878, expressing his desire 'to take them in' and 'to work with them as Fellows'.³² At this point one could safeguard Olcott by assuming his ignorance of that Vinaya rule prior to his arrival in Ceylon, and that may probably be the reason for the formation of a separate section for the priests. But how then can one justify the enrolment of eminent and ordinary priests to the branches of the B.T.S on equal terms with laymen,³³ and the selection of eminent priests to work with the lay Theosophists of the Mother Society between 1880 and 1882?³⁴ The admission of these priests as members of the B.T.S in the eyes of Olcott could not be reconciled with his own principles by any belated excuses. By these enrolments, the superior position held by the bhikkhus in these

32. Letter written by Olcott to Piyaratana on 29.8.1878.

33. Bulatgama nāyaka thera presided the meeting at Galle and Migeṭṭuvattē delivered a lecture with Olcott. (O.D.L., Second Series, p.167). Potuvila Indajoti, Vaskaḍuvē Subhūti, Vāligama Sumangala were accepted as members of the Society, (ibid, p.177). Seven priests sent by Potuvila to Bentara were accepted (p.197), Vimalasāra and twelve priests from Vālitara were accepted by Olcott. (ibid, p.203).

34. In 1881, Sumangala nāyaka thera was appointed Vice president of the ensuing year, and Mohoṭṭivattē, Potuvila, Bulatgama and Doḍandūve as General Councillors, though they were neglected in their own land. Supplement to The Theosophist, Vol.2, No.9, (June 1881), unpaginated.

activities was minimised and brought down to the plane of the laymen.

His policy of segregation of Buddhist priests from laymen in religious affairs was continued in 1881, during his second visit to Ceylon, Olcott extended it to social activities as well and thereby kept the priests totally silent and inactive in both fields.

Olcott was well aware of the social value of the patronship of the monks in the Sinhalese Buddhist society when he underwent the various ceremonies during his first visit, at the grand reception accorded to him by Migeṭṭuvattē and the other high priests and the meetings that followed after that with bhikkhus in the chair. Olcott shrewdly used the monks for his ventures. At the formation of the 'Sinhalese National Buddhistic Educational Fund' (Sinhala Jātiyaṭa Ayiti Bauddha Adhyāpana Aramudala) for the 'promotion of denominational education and the diffusion of religious intelligence',³⁵ he secured the signatures of the leading Buddhist priests of the Siamese and Amarapura sects for the circular to be sent to the Buddhist villagers of the country through village headmen and village temples before the organisation of addresses

35. The Ceylon Times, 8.6.1881.

to collect money. The same signatories ³⁶ recommended Olcott in writing as a 'genuine trustworthy friend of the desperate Buddhists in Ceylon'.

The unity shown in the interests of Buddhism on religious welfare activities irrespective of petty differences of opinion is clearly illustrated by these two documents. The bhikkhus of Amarapura and Siamese sects had collectively forgotten their engagement in the controversy about Upasampadā or higher ordination.³⁷ Priests of the Malvatta chapter and the Kalani chapter signed in the name of the Siam Nikāya while the Mūlavamsa sect, the Saddhammavamsa sect, the Kalyāṇivamsa sect and the Saddhammayuktika sect represented the Amarapura Nikāya. Apart from this it is amazing to see the consent of Āmbagahavattē Saranankara to placing his name under the Amarapura sect, forgetting all the existing controversies. Even at that time Olcott could have avoided the harmful results of his principle if he had understood the implications of the sects in the community of the bhikkhus.

36. Siamese sect

Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala
Potuvila Indajoti
Mullēriyāvē Gunaratana
Talāhēnē Amaramoli
Koṭuvēgoḍa Gñānānanda
Heyyantuḍuvē Devamitta

Amarapura sect

Bulatgama Sirisumanatissa
M.Sumanatissa
Doḍandūvē Piyyaratanatissa
Vāligama Sumangala
Vālitara Dhammalankara
Vaskaḍuvē Subhūti
Vālitara Āsabhatissa
M.Gunānanda
Āmbagahavattē Saranankara.

It is interesting to note that the founder of the Rāmañña sect too signed the document as a bhikkhu of the Amarapura sect, seventeen years after establishing the new sect.

37. Pānadurē Vādaya, (1955), p.76.

Before this circular was drafted Olcott had the idea to keep the Fund 'under the general guardianship of the Buddhist priesthood of the Western Province and under the immediate supervision of a twelve member committee of eminent bhikkhus'.³⁸ But in the circular printed on 16.8.1881 we find the names of two administrators and a wealthy Muhandiram as the Trustees of the Fund.³⁹ When the campaign to address the Buddhist gatherings and the collection of money started, only the services of Migeṭṭuvattē Gunānanda were accepted and renowned Buddhist priest leaders like Kolōmba Sobhita, Doḍandūvē Piyaratanatissa and Pānadurē Gunaratana (who had experience in organising and maintaining Buddhist schools in the face of so many barriers from the missionaries, till the director of Public Instruction recognised these schools as government Grant-in-Aid schools) were eliminated from this venture. Gunānanda's service would have been indispensable at that time due to his massive influence on the Buddhist revival before Olcott's arrival. Olcott was accompanied by William De Abrew and James De Zoysa⁴⁰ in his lecture tours with Migeṭṭuvattē to collect money. This marks the first

38. Supplement to The Theosophist, Vol. 3, No. 4, (January 1882), p. 4.

39. E. R. Gunaratna Atapattu Mudliar for Galle, Hendrick De Silva Goonasekara Aracchi for Negombo and Andiris Perera Dharmagunavardena for Colombo.

40. The Theosophist, Vol. 3, No. 2, (November 1881), p. 2.

appearance of laymen to stress the necessity of religious education, side by side with a Buddhist priest in the sight of ordinary Buddhists. Out of the forty meetings organised to collect money only fifteen addresses were allowed to be delivered by Gunānanda;⁴¹ the others were assigned to lay members of the Society. Though the Fund was designated as 'Sinhalese, Buddhistic and Educational', the priests who traditionally had advised the ordinary laymen on matters concerning these three spheres and had acted accordingly before 1880 by establishing a Sinhalese Buddhist printing press at Galle to combat the Christian literature, and by founding schools along modern lines to face the missionary educational challenge, were totally neglected and discarded by the Theosophists after 1881. Every step was taken to substitute a class of new rich men and administrators as the leaders of the social and religious affairs of the Island in place of the Buddhist monks. Thus after 1881, the new social and religious awakening aroused through the activities of the B.T.S brought to the attention of the ordinary Buddhists a group of new lay leaders who had recognition in society as wealthy men or as administrators and were now advising them on Buddhism and religious education instead of the Buddhist monks.

41. Decennial Report of the Theosophical Society, (1890).

4243

In 1881, the untiring lay members of the B.T.S started another new scheme to raise money for the Fund. Small earthen pots(kāṭa) taken in a pushing cart were distributed to every house in the streets of Colombo after a lecture delivered by one of those members (or by two of them sometimes). Those who received the tills would collect small coins in them. The members would come monthly to collect the old tills and supply new ones instead. Another new feature added for the collection of money was fancy bazaars where the people who lived in Colombo supplied goods to be sold at a bazaar held at the Theosophical Society Headquarters. That the using and handling of money was prohibited for bhikkhus was an idea preached by the priests of the Rāmaṇṇa Nikāya, and Olcott who had accepted the views of that sect as pure, thus secured the chance to eradicate all the connections of the Buddhist priests with the Sinhalese National Buddhistic Educational Fund.

The crisis the Theosophical Society encountered in India compelled Olcott to aim at Ceylon for a firm holding. Pandit Swami Dayananda Saraswati, 'one of the foremost adepts in India', the founder of the Ārya Samāj, who

42.H.S.Olcott, O.D.L (Second Series),p.323.

But O.D.L ,Third Series(1904), gives this year as 1885, pp.353-354, and the Decennial Report of the Buddhist Theosophical Society dates it as 31.4.1886.p.42.

43. William De Abrew and J.R. De Silva.

had joined the Society in 1878,⁴⁴ started a critical campaign against the Founders of Theosophy on twenty sixth March 1882, after an address in Bombay where he distributed pamphlets accusing 'the liars and cheating jugglers' who first believed in Iswar, as preached by him, and acknowledged him as their spiritual guide, but subsequently became Buddhists and finally Zoroastrians.⁴⁵ There were suspicions against Blavatsky of being a 'Russian spy'.⁴⁶ These incidents forced Olcott to prepare a more sound and troublefree foundation for the future and on eighteenth July 1882, disregarding the opposition raised by Blavatsky, he came to Ceylon to collect money for the Education Fund which he had started the previous year.⁴⁷ The first part of this series of lectures was confined to the Southern Province of the Island. When Olcott reached the Island he was informed by the President of the Galle Theosophical Society, G.C.A.Jayasekara, that the Society had made arrangements for seventyfive lectures in the Southern

44.J.N.Farquhar,Modern Religious Movements in India,(1924), p.110.

45.Supplement to The Theosophist,Vol.3,No.7,(April 1882),p.8.

46.The Theosophist,Vol.3,No.10,(July 1882),pp.259-260.

47.H.S.Olcott, O.D.L, Second Series,p.326.

province.⁴⁸ It seems to the impartial religious student that the Buddhist priests of that time thought that it was their duty and responsibility to arrange these lay gatherings and one can still see the influence of the Buddhist priests on the society of Sinhalese Buddhists as the meetings materialised. Though the priests did not promise to Olcott they were able to arrange thirtynine lectures while the promised Society in Galle held only fourteen lectures.⁴⁹ This exhibits not only the competition the Buddhist priests had to face from the upcoming lay organisers of the B.T.S but their accepted position as the advisers and organisers of lay gatherings in the social and religious activities of Sinhalese Buddhist society. Another significant factor in the series of this year's lectures was the exclusion of the few Buddhist priests who lectured on religious education and appealed for subscriptions from their lay devotees. Heyyantuḍuvē Devamitta, Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala, Vaskaḍuvē Subhūti, Sirinivāsa, Uḍugampola Suvannajoti and Talāhēnē Amaramoli gave the lectures held in the previous year in aid of the Education Fund.⁵⁰ These priests

48. Supplement to The Theosophist, Vol. 3, No. 12, (September 1882), p. 1.

49. Supplement to The Theosophist, Vol. 4, No. 3, (December 1882), pp. 6-7.

50. Supplement to The Theosophist, Vol. 3, No. 4 (January 1882), pp. 6-7.

who had ^{an} important role to play in these areas were not invited in 1882 to collect money. Mohoṭṭivattē Gunānanda too was excluded from lecturing to the Buddhists of these areas to whom he had introduced the Theosophists two years before. Olcott was accompanied by the lay members of the Colombo branch, most of whom had become successful in the field of business after leaving their birth places in these provinces. During the period from twentyninth July to twentythird October 1882, Olcott and his lay followers of the Society addressed sixtyfour Buddhist lay gatherings, stressing the necessity of religious education.⁵¹

These lay members under the instruction of Olcott, in the formation of the Buddhist Defence Committee (Bauddhāraṅga Sabhāva) in 1884, strongly supported the policy of the Founder president to exempt the bhikkhus from religious activities. The need for the establishment of this Committee arose out of a religious grievance. The first meeting was held at Vidyodaya Pirivena, Māligākaṇḍa, to discuss the situation of the Buddhists on 27. January 1884 with high priest Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala in the chair, and the formation of the Committee took place on the next day, following the procedure of the previous day. But what was noteworthy in the structure

51. Supplement to The Theosophist, Vol. 4, No. 3, (December 1882), pp. 3-8.

of the Committee was the exclusion of the priests from its membership. The handful of lay members ⁵² kept the power to regulate the enrolments of members in their own hands. Olcott was unanimously appointed the honorary president of the Committee, but not the high priest Sumangala who had suggested the idea of a Committee. The Theosophists believed in the inefficiency and unsuitability of bhikkhus for this sort of work, forgetting the active role they had played in organising and advising various societies ⁵³ in the interest of religion during the religious controversies with the Christians. Once an inquisitive member of the Committee out of sheer curiosity questioned the chairman Simon Perera Dharmagunavardhana, a pious devotee of high priest Sumangala, on the differentiation of the monks from the laymen in the Committee. The chairman said in a reply that 'the Buddhist priests are bound to render assistance to this movement'. ⁵⁴ If the Committee was concerned with the defence of Buddhism, what harm could have been

52. William De Abrew, H. Don Karolis, D. D. Abhayaratna, J. P. Jayatilaka, J. R. De Silva, S. P. Dharmagunavardhana, B. H. Kure, Seditis Silva, R. A. Mirando, C. A. Silva, and C. P. Goonavardena were the members of this Committee for a long time.
Souvenir, Diamond Jubilee of the Theosophical Society, (1940), unpaginated.

53. Before Olcott's arrival some societies were functioning in the Sinhalese Buddhist society, such as Sarvagna Sāsānābhivṛddhīdāyaka Samāgama (1862), Dharmaparāyana Samāgama (1871), Saddharma Dīpti Samāgama (1872), Sāsānadhaja Samāgama and Bauddha Prakāśa Samāgama (1873).

54. Supplement to The Theosophist, Vol. vii, No. 84, (September 1886), p. cl.

caused by the participation of the bhikkhus? This was a question that received no answer.

The collection of money for the Fund was irritating, but did not allow Olcott to despair of the situation, since he had hopes of a firm foundation in Ceylon. Those who had subscribed the one rupee in the list the previous year had gone home with happy memories and completely forgotten about the contribution they had promised. The enthusiasm of the organisers had diminished with Olcott's disappearance from the Island. The popular 'flashlike' enthusiasm enabled only the organisers and the ordinary Buddhist public to dream of 'schools at every cross road' which never proved to be a reality. To the utter disappointment of Olcott he could not collect even a hundred rupees of the promised money, though the list of subscriptions amounted to thirteen thousand rupees.⁵⁵

In 1886, he brought with him an indefatigable preacher from England, C.W. Leadbeater, who travelled in the Western and North Western provinces addressing twenty nine gatherings.⁵⁶ In May he started a tour of his own with H.D. David as interpreter to the Salpiti Kōralē and Piṭigal Kōralē,⁵⁷ but unfortunately could

55. H.S. Olcott, O.D.L, Second Series, pp. 296-300 and pp. 304-326.

56. H.S. Olcott, O.D.L, Third Series, p. 359. But the Decennial Report of the Theosophical Society speaks of 20 lectures at Chilaw and Negombo and 13 in Colombo.

57. Some reports mentioned the names as Alutkūru Kōralē and Sat Kōralē.

not collect a single penny for the Fund as the 'use of money was scarcely known in these areas'.⁵⁸

In 1889, Olcott continued his policy in regard to the monks in the formation of another five new branches at Anuradhapura, Matale, Mavanalla, Kurunagala and Kataluva,⁵⁹ staffed by the higher administrative officers of the up-country such as raṭṭe mahattayā, kōralē mahattayā and disāve mahattayā,⁶⁰ and the wealthy merchants from the low-country who were engaged in business in these areas. Thus during the first decade of its existence in Ceylon, the Theosophical Society and its Founder president successfully implemented the idea of separating the bhikkhus from religious activities and minimising their social acceptance.

During this decade not only Olcott but his European and American colleagues who visited the Island in the interest of Theosophy followed the same policy of exclusion of Buddhist priests from religious work with tremendous success. Charles F. Powell, a Theosophist

58. Supplement to The Theosophist, Vol. vii, No. 83, (August 1886), p. cxlv.

59. Mahā Mahīndra (20.6.1889), Ubhayalōkārthasādhaka (15.7.1889), Ānanda (25.6.1889), Maliyadēva (26.6.1889) and Sāriputta (4.7.1889).

The Buddhist, edited by A. E. Buultjens, Vol. 1, No. 33, (2.8.1889), p. 264.

Supplement to The Theosophist, Vol. x, No. 119, pp. cxliii-cxliv.

60. Kataluva is the only low-country branch. In all the branches 5 r. mahattayās, 3 k. mahattayās, 2 d. mahattayās 3 Mudliars and one Muhandiram were appointed. The Buddhist, Vol. 1, No. 30, (12.7.1889), p. 239.

from America, after accepting the Five Precepts from Sumangala nāyaka thera started a tour to Matale. In 1889, he alone founded six new branches of the B.T.S in Trincomalee (two branches), Batticalo (two branches), Vāligama and Dikvālla,⁶¹ and reorganised the already defunct branch at Matara.

By this time the Buddhist Theosophists had been able to establish six functioning Buddhist schools in the Island,⁶² though the number in the propaganda literature seems to be in hundreds. The highly unpractical self interested movement of starting 'Buddhist schools' was springing up with a 'mushroom enthusiasm' throughout the Western and Southern parts of the country. These openings of new schools, formation of committees to start new Buddhist schools, distribution of books written by Theosophists to the children of these schools and inspection of lessons and sites of existing schools always meant audiences and addresses for the new arrivals and the lay members, who thus reached the ranks of preachers of the Society. But most of these schools never functioned properly.

61. Sugatapāla and Satcitānandan in Trincomalee, Mahādēva and Paragñānamārga in Batticalo, Siddhārtha in Vāligama and Moggalīputtātissa in Dikvālla.
The Buddhist, Vol. 1, No. 38 (6.9.1889), p. 304; No. 39, (13.9.1889), p. 307; No. 47, (1.11.1889), p. 368.

62. Decennial Report of the Theosophical Society, p. 18.

A.E.Buultjens, a Cambridge graduate who had apostatised from his Christian religion, started his educational and religious work in Raygam Kōralē, an area hitherto neglected by the Theosophists, in 1890.⁶³ At this time a noteworthy feature of the organisation of these lectures in villages was its confinement in the main to the hands of respectable laymen. None of these lectures were organised by the priests. Thus by 1890 the priests, who had at first taken an active part in the religious work, had completely left the scene as a result of the Buddhist Theosophical Society. The twelve villages at Horana where Buultjens delivered lectures were arranged and organised by D.I.B. Kuruppu, the registrar of Horana and the Muhandiram of Raygam Kōralē.⁶⁴ In Horana, Buultjens founded 'Śāsana Vardhana Samāgama' following the same lines as his predecessors.⁶⁵

Dr.J.Bowles Daly, a strict Theosophist, who arrived in Ceylon in the same year and after taking the Five Precepts was appointed the General Secretary of the Society and subsequently the General Manager of the

63.The Buddhist, Vol.ii, No.20, (9.5.1890), p.160.

64.The Buddhist, Vol.ii, No.21, (14.5.1890), p.164.

65.idem, p.160.

Buddhist schools of the B.T.S, felt disheartened at the prevailing tragic standard of the Education Fund and inaugurated a new 'National Buddhistic Fund' with 'the view of providing Buddhist schools throughout the Island introducing a measure of Industrial and Technical education'.⁶⁶ From Kandy he went to Sabaragamuva and finally came to Galle. Dharmapala Hevavitarana, formerly known as H.D.David or H.Don David, accompanied C.W. Leadbeater, Chas F.Powell,A.E.Buultjens and Dr.J.Bowles Daly in their tours as the interpreter.⁶⁷

In the light of this evidence we are now in a position to assess the absolute success of the Theosophists' policy of segregating the community of bhikkhus in religious and social affairs as well. We can trace the gradual effect of these principles on the role of monks in three different stages. First in 1880, the priests organised the Buddhist gatherings, addressed and introduced the European Theosophists to the audience and sometimes translated the speeches given in English to Sinhalese. During the second stage the meetings were

66.The Buddhist,Vol.ii,No.22,(23.5.1890),p.171,
The Buddhist,Vol.ii,No.30,(18.5.1890),p.240,
The Buddhist,Vol.ii,No.31,(25.7.1890),p.244,
The Buddhist,Vol.ii,No.33,(8.8.1890),p.264.

67.When Dharmapala left for Japan John Richard De Silva went with Powell for a short time.
The Buddhist,Vol.ii,No.4 (10.1.1890),p.30.

organised by the priests as they had promised at the Convention of the priests, while the gatherings were addressed by the European Theosophists and their lay translators, and lay preachers, neglecting the presence of the bhikkhus. The third and the final stage which comes under the period of our discussion is marked by the complete absence of monks from organising meetings, addressing meetings or participating in the work of the Theosophists.

The illogical respect and the incredible honours tendered to Olcott and the other European Theosophists by the feeble monks of the Siamese and Amarapura sects actually stimulated the Theosophists to follow Olcott in actions aimed against the bhikkhus of these two sects, while the friendliness of the Rāmañña sect gave encouragement to the Theosophists to secure the power to govern the community of bhikkhus.

Olcott made every attempt to exclude the Buddhist priests from religious and social activities but his status was reverently strengthened by the same priests. Before his arrival in Ceylon, Piyaṛatanatissa nāyaka thera and the other residential priests of Śailabimbārāmaya, Doḍandūva, believed in Olcott as a physician who possessed a supernatural power to cure serious diseases. Olcott

declared himself as an 'ignorant student of Mesmerism or Animal Magnetism' but prescribed medical advice to a young bhikkhu of the temple before his arrival in the Island.⁶⁸ When the Theosophists visited the country some priests who had read the descriptions of Blavatsky's power to create 'miracles' appealed to her to demonstrate her powers in public and they venerated her as a goddess.⁶⁹ Through sheer timidity the mahānāyakas of Malvatta and Asgiriya had declared their inability to restore order among the bhikkhus of the Siamese sect.⁷⁰ Meanwhile Sumangala nāyaka thera of the Siamese sect elevated Olcott in a letter by designating him a 'second Dharmāsōka' in 1880.⁷¹

After realising the weak position of the monks in Ceylon, Olcott invited thirty bhikkhus of the Amarapura and Siamese sects, on the fourth of July 1880, for a Convention of priests. After offering alms in two different rooms he expressed his intentions to unite the two sects and to eradicate misbehaviour among the

68. Letter written by Olcott to Piyaaratana nāyaka thera on 3.2.1880. Though he declared his ignorance on this subject in this letter he expertly delivered lectures on 'Mesmerism' and 'Magnetic Healing' in 1882, with illustrations and was accepted as a 'great mesmerist' by his followers.

Reminiscences of Olcott, by various writers, compiled by Hridaya Narain Agarwal, (1932) Madras, pp. 59-61, and p. 68.

69. The Theosophist, Vol. 1, No. 10, (July 1880), p. 259.

70. H. S. Olcott, O. D. L., Sixth Series, (1935), p. 154.

71. Golden Book of the Theosophical Society, edited by C. Jinarajadasa, (1925), p. 93.

bhikkhus. Olcott did not invite the monks of the Rāmañña sect for this Convention. He believed that the monks of these two sects needed a purification while the bhikkhus of Rāmañña sect exhibited the 'pristine beauty' of the ideal bhikkhus. His ignorance about the origin of the Amarapura sect had inclined him to exercise his powers to unite these two sects. Amarapura Nikāya was the result of social oppression. But when Olcott criticised the sects in front of the priests they were silent and it seemed to Olcott that whatever he said was accepted by the listening priests.

By 1889, the priests of the Siamese and Amarapura sects had realised the results of the activities of the Theosophists which they were subjected to. But Sumangala nāyaka thera of the Siamese sect encouraged the arrival of more European and American Theosophists in the country 'to eradicate the unhappy divisions among the Sinhalese Buddhists'.⁷²

Dr. Bowles Daly, the general secretary of the Society, sent a circular to the lay members of the B.T.S inviting them for the second annual Convention at Kandy in the month of November, 1890. The objects to be discussed in this Convention were outlined by him. One of the six

72. The Buddhist, Vol. 1, No. 34, (9.8.1889), Arrival of Mr. Charles F. Powell, pp. 270-271.

subjects discussed at the meetings was a proposal to hold a synod to reform the Buddhist priesthood of the Island.⁷³ Though there were no bhikkhus present during these critical discussions they must have heard of the allegations against them, but we are hardly able to note any reaction by the monks against the critics. Dr. Daly was one of the vicious critics of the priests and encouraged laymen to criticise the monks in public.⁷⁴ Once in his presidential address at the Convention of Galle he declared that 'many of the petty quarrels in the villages have been fomented by the priesthood' and recommended 'the necessity of introducing some changes in the monastic system, which stands much in need of reformation'.⁷⁵

While these two sects were subjected to these destructive criticisms, the Theosophists' position in regard to the Rāmañña sect was a friendly one. The disciples of Āmbagahavattē Saranankara invited Olcott to set fire to the funeral pyre of their late leader, and to address the gathering, in 1886,⁷⁶ and in the same year Olcott had invited Ilukvattē Medhankara thera,

73. The Buddhist, Vol. ii, No. 47, (14.11.1889), The Second Annual Convention of the Ceylon Branch of the Theosophical Society, p. 369.

74. J. B. Daly, Report of the Galle Convention, (1891), p. ii.

75. *ibid*, p. 17 and p. 19.

76. H. S. Olcott, O. D. L., (Third Series), pp. 346-347.

of the Rāmañña sect, as the one and the only priest to participate in a Convention held at Adyar.⁷⁷ The first death anniversary of Āmbagahavattē Mahānāyaka thera was celebrated at Dūvē Mūla Vihāraya in the presence of Olcott in 1887.⁷⁸ The lay devotees of Vijayānanda Vihāraya, Galle, proposed to erect a life size statue of Olcott in granite at the temple premises with a statue of their late leader.⁷⁹

The respectful recognition of the Theosophists by the Buddhist priests, despite the contemptuous attitude extended to them, was exceeded by the cordial hospitality of the laymen, who were very successful in reducing the status of the bhikkhus to a secondary place. The Sinhalese were one of the more backward nations in the field of trade and business.⁸⁰ During the period of foreign domination, especially in the times of the British, an interest was created among some of the village youths in the modern avenues of earning money. When the port of call was changed from Galle to Colombo, a considerable number of such villagers established themselves as successful businessmen and merchants in the Capital city.⁸¹

77. U. Suvannajōti, Ilukvattē Medhankara Caritaya, (1889), p. 16.

78. Supplement to The Theosophist, Vol. viii, No. 90, p. lxxxv.

79. Sarasavi Saṇḍarasa, 16.4.1886, reproduced the letter written by K. D. Adiriyān De Silva, the president of the dāyaka sabhā, on 7.4.1886 and the reply of Olcott.

80. To encourage the Sinhalese in these fields 'Velanda Mitrayā' in 1885 and 'Velanda Saṅgarāva' in 1895 were started by the merchants in Colombo.

81. Arnold Wright, Twentieth Century Impressions of Ceylon, (1907), pp. 474-476, pp. 481-482.

Meanwhile some villagers of the low-country went to the Up-country and even further remoter areas in search of centres for trade. The rich landowners scattered over the country spent money on the new plantation industry and in the mining of plumbago.⁸² Most of these merchants and businessmen who became prosperous in Colombo and other towns Up-country and in the low-country had to face a serious social problem. Govigama, (were the) numerical majority of the Sinhalese society, were the proudest but the poorest community. Others who belonged to the socially undistinguished castes had been excluded from most social and religious affairs for a long time. In the early 19 th century the commendable sagacity of some of the monks had brought to the lay devotees of these castes the opportunity to participate in their ancestral religion with their Govigama counterparts. The monks of Halāgama, Karāwe and Durāva communities had founded their different sects during the first half of the nineteenth century. But the success of the wealthy merchants was not counted

82. A list of these plumbago merchants appears in Twentieth Century Impressions of Ceylon, edited by Arnold Wright, (1907) London, pp. 588-625.

in the Island because of their castes.⁸³ The caste controversies sponsored by the famous scholarly monks of the Siamese sect and the Amarapura sect continued for a long time and the literature written by the bhikkhus and laymen embittered the feelings of the Govigama, Karāwe, Durāva and Navandanna castes ^{again} with each other.⁸⁴ The sentiments of this social depression found a new outlet in the Buddhist Theosophical Society which brought men a social and a religious recognition irrespective of their castes.

83. This could be clearly illustrated by the events which occurred in 1901, after the conferring of the title, 'Muhandiram Vaniga Vijayasekara' on N.S. Fernando, the most successful businessman of Vahumpura(hakuru) caste, the onetime treasurer of the B.T.S, the patroniser of the two trade journals in Sinhalese, publisher of the first book in Sinhalese, with colourful illustrations (Jataka Pota), and a faithful devotee of Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala and Ratmalānē Dhammāloka. His appointment was ridiculed and criticised by B. Subhūti of the Siamese sect and of the Govigama caste, neglecting his marvellous service to Buddhism and Sinhalese.

84. The Govigamas and Karāwes maintained their 'kṣatriya' origin, while Durāva had traced their origin to the 'Skandhavāra' or 'Kaṇḍavuru' kula, and the Navandanno to the creator god of the world, Viśvakarma. Most of the literature written was polemic or illogical. The literature is inaccessible to the research student in Ceylon, since the owners including the government authorities suffer from mixed feelings. These caste controversies, started in 1876, still play a dominant role in every field of Sinhalese society.

Among the Govigama community who thought of their nobility, no signs of a religious or social awakening took place. The high class Hindus in India had founded societies for social and religious reforms based on Hinduism before the arrival of the Theosophists.⁸⁵ Unfortunately 'the guardians of religious and national purity' in Ceylon were unable to influence the frame of mind of the nation with such a religious or social consciousness, before 1880.

Thus the wealthier class of the socially 'low' castes gained social recognition with the offices of the B.T.S.⁸⁶

85. J.N. Farquhar, Modern Religious Movements in India, (1924), London, describes the existence of Brahma Samaj (1828), p.34, Parama Hansa Sabha (1849), p.75, Prarthana Samaj (1867), p.76, Sadharan Dharma Sabha (1865), p.186, Sanatana Dharma Raksini Sabha (1873), p.187, and Arya Samaj (1874), p.109.

86. The Societies established in 1880 consisted of the members of the following castes;

Colombo branch :- except Baṭuvantuḍāvē all the others were Karāwe, Halāgama and Durāva. H.D. Karolis though a Govigama was married to a Durāva.

Pānadura branch :- Halāgama and Karāwe.

Bentoṭa and

Vālitara branches :- Halāgama

Galle branch :- predominantly Halāgama except the vice-president, Pandita and two councillors.

Mātara branch :- predominantly Durāva caste.

Kandy branch :- except the president other key posts were held by Halāgama and Karāwe who had migrated from the low-country.

Societies founded in 1889.

Anurādhapura branch :- two posts were held by low-country merchants.

Mātalē branch :- three posts for the low-country merchants.

Kataluva branch :- only Karāwe caste.

Vāligama branch :- Durāva and Karāwe castes.

Dikvālla branch :- Durāva caste.

Trincomalee branch :- Low-country merchants of Halagama and Karāwe castes.

Most of the lay members who joined as officials were 'convinced Theosophists' although they believed in Buddhism. D.C.Pedris,⁸⁷ a proctor of Vahumpura caste, R.De Fonseka,⁸⁸ a proctor of Karāwe caste and M. Dharmaratna,⁸⁹ the editor of Lakminipahana and an ex-Buddhist priest of the Karāwe caste discussed the 'inability of Buddhism to eradicate the caste system from Ceylon and the success of the Theosophy in doing so'. The pronouncement by P.Holly that all Sinhalese belonged to the Śūdra caste⁹⁰ gave all the Buddhist Theosophists a strength to fight against the caste system. 'The unusual sight was presented' described Olcott 'at the dinner to the fiftyseven members of the B.T.S, of principal castes sitting and eating together'.⁹¹ A membership and an office in the B.T.S brought with it

87.The Buddhist, Vol.1, No.9, (Navam Fullmoon day of 2432), p.71.

88.The Buddhist, Vol.ii, No.36, (29.8.1890); Theosophy in Ceylon' pp.282-283.

89.Lakminipahana, 27.7.1910.

90.The Buddhist, Vol.1, No.38, (6.9.1889), 'Caste', pp.297-299.

91.Supplement to The Theosophist, Vol.2, No.11, (August 1881), p.249.

social acceptance and recognition to the newly wealthy class, which their vast amount of money could not obtain. Except for this, there could scarcely be any cause which called for a reconciliation between Buddhism and Theosophy.

The term Theosophy is described by the leaders of the movement in different terms in different countries and it lies out of my scope to discuss these various definitions. 'A Theosophist is one who gives you the theory of God or the works of the God' wrote Blavatsky in the first editorial of the Theosophist,⁹² the organ of the Society. The idea of God and His creations were utterly contradictory elements to Buddhism. Apart from this main factor there existed superficial similarities between it and Theosophy. The 'Universal Brotherhood of Humanity' was nothing new to the Buddhists though they did not practice it. The Theosophists delivered lectures on the 'Law of Action' (Kamma), Rebirth and Nirvāna with different definitions of these terms, but did not come under the criticism of the illiterate Buddhists or of the scholarly priests who were deceived by the similarity of their titles. The miracles exhibited by Blavatsky resembled the descriptions of 'irdhi' in the Buddhist literature.

92. The Theosophist, Vol. 1, No. 1, (October 1879), What is Theosophy, p. 2.

All these superficial affinities misguided the minds of the priests and the laymen, and during the first twentyfive years of existence only once do we come across the rejection by a scholarly monk of an idea expressed by Olcott regarding the Nirvāṇa.⁹³

The first decade of the Society in Ceylon witnessed the most prosperous period of the movement, along with signs of its future decline. Although it has now become the Society with the longest history in the recent past of the Island,⁹⁴ it did not continue to enjoy the marvellous reception it had in the eighties. The number of the members of the Society on 31.7.1881 was eightyseven, but after the formation of another fifteen new branches it reached only one hundred and thirteen in 1889.⁹⁵ By the end of the decade inspite of all the cordiality it received at the beginning the B.T.S became the target of public criticism. We are able to note remonstrances from various parts of the Island, in the first few years of its second decade. These islandwide protests were the result of the dissension which occurred between Olcott and his first Ceylonese Buddhist friend, Mohoṭṭivattē Gunānanda.

93. H.S. Olcott, O.D.L (Second Series), pp. 300-302.

94. It still exists with a handful of members of the Karāwe caste.

95. In 1940 it had only 169 members.

Olcott after the death of Mohoṭṭivattē Gunānanda wrote a note in regard to the 'disgusting behaviour' of the deceased. 'When the Trust deed was being drafted he had given us no end of bother' wrote Olcott and 'his aim seemed to have been to get the absolute control of the money, regardless of the rights of all who had also helped in the raising of the Funds'.⁹⁶ We are unable to assess this statement since nothing has been written by Migeṭṭuvattē about this event, but the chances are not too remote to dismiss this allegation. As we have noted earlier Olcott was not generous enough to offer any sort of governing power of the Education Fund either to a Buddhist priest or to the raisers of the Fund, but only to the trustees he selected in 1881. Olcott did mention the interference of Mohoṭṭivattē in his description of the events of 1883, and by this time we are pretty certain that the exclusion from lecturing to raise Funds had also been enforced on Mohoṭṭivattē. That a priest who had devoted his full life for the upliftment of religion after delivering fifteen lectures in 1881 to raise the Fund should be deprived of all control over it for fear that he might misuse it sounds absurd. It would be incredible, and would contradict the normal texture of his activities, if he should misuse such a fund. For

96. H.S. Olcott, O.D.L (Third Series), p.405.

thirtyone years, starting with Bōdhirāja Samāgama in 1849, he had delivered more than five thousand lectures on Buddhism throughout the Island, without gaining anything.⁹⁷

With the assistance of the same document of Olcott we can suspect that this difference smells not of a 'financial matter' but of a 'social affair'. In 1887, Migeṭṭuvattē criticised the Colombo branch of the Society 'for its inability to open schools throughout the province'.⁹⁸ This allegation throws some light on the reality of the picture. Migeṭṭuvattē was a priest of the Halāgama community and was born in a predominantly Halāgama area, Balapitiya, and entered the order while living at Ratgama, the other stronghold of the Salāgama caste in Ceylon. The first layman introduced to the Theosophists by Mohoṭṭivattē was J.R.De Silva of his caste and he was appointed as the representative of the Theosophists in Ceylon. Mohoṭṭivattē introduced the Theosophists to the ordinary Sinhalese Buddhists. This must have created an interest among the Salāgama community. The impact of Theosophy among the members of the Halāgama caste is clearly reflected in the structure of the branch societies along the coast from

97. M. Vimaladhamma, Śrī Gunānanda Yati Caritaya, (1937), pp. 15-17. The Theosophist, Vol. 1, No. 2, (November 1879) says by that time he has preached over 5000 discourses on Buddhism, p. 34.

98. H. S. Olcott, O. D. L., (Third Series), p. 405.

Colombo to Galle. The presidents of the Colombo, Pānadura, Bentara, Vālitara, and Galle branches were all Salāgamas. Yet in the establishments of the schools we find the complete neglect of the two strongholds of this caste. Throughout the long history of the Society, for unknown reasons Balapiṭṭiya and Ratgama, the birth place and the religious place of Mohoṭṭivattē, were ignored by the Theosophists. The acceptance of the Salāgama caste was not rewarded by Olcott and his followers. They might have expected a profit from the harvest, which one of the monks of their caste had prepared. Can not we surmise that this may be the reason for the argument between Olcott and Migeṭṭuvattē?

Mohoṭṭivattē 'the silver tongued orator' (so described by Olcott in 1879), with the consent of Sumangala nāyaka thera, invited Olcott to be present at a lecture which would be delivered at Pahala Pansala, Koṭahēna, on 18.2. 1887. His address, a sharp criticism on the Society and its president, could not be answered by Olcott since he never understood the language, but the audience who had heard praises from this critic in the past, was surprised and provoked by his criticism. Finally he challenged Olcott to reply to his accusations on the following day. Without realising the situation Olcott promptly accepted the invitation, thinking it was another invitation for a

lecture to the Buddhists, since he was at the disposal of the Buddhists for addresses. Mohoṭṭivattē announced the acceptance of Olcott to deliver the lecture on the next day.

Things changed suddenly. At the temple of Maligakanda, Sumangala nāyaka thera divulged the happenings and 'seemed shaken in his friendship' for Olcott.⁹⁹ After listening Olcott became furious and upbraided Sumangala for not informing him of Gunānanda's intention beforehand. Curious crowds gathered at Koṭahēna at the due time. But by that time the invited speaker was in ship 'sailing away from the wily fowler'.

The unfortunate audience thus could not hear the reply of Olcott but could read the vehement criticisms of Mohoṭṭivattē on the Theosophists. He started his newspaper, 'The Rays of the Sun' (Rivirāsa) on 8.1.1888 and launched his campaign to discredit them. One advertisement concerning the paper says that the Buddhists of this country who were misled by the Theosophists had no newspaper to express their ideas clearly.¹⁰⁰ One motive of the paper was to expose

99.H.S.Olcott,O.D.L,(Third Series),pp.406-407.

100.'samahara samāgamavala aya Buddhāgamaṭa muvāvi sīṭagena Buddhāgamaṃ anyākārayakaṭa peralanṭa hadana eka nāvātvima pinisat mē kālayē Buddhāgama sambandayen kriyā karana patrayak ōṇāmaya'.
Lakminipahana,24.12.1887.

the B.T.S which attempted to destroy Buddhism while working under the pretension of Buddhism. He accused them for not providing the public from whom they had collected money with a balance sheet.¹⁰¹ Not only the Theosophists but their loyal advisors of the Rāmañña sect also came under the severe criticisms of Mohoṭṭivattē. On receipt of the new newspaper, Lakminipahana praised the venture and criticised the un-Buddhistic attitude of Sarasavi Saṇḍarāsa, which merely contained lists of fancy bazaars, the weddings, travellings, lectures and the deaths of the Theosophists.¹⁰² Saṇḍarāsa was accused of collecting funds from the Buddhists by deceit. Finally the editor of Lakminipahana appealed to the Buddhist scholars and the wealthy men who had been misled through their ignorance to turn to the correct way and discard Theosophy, like Siddhārtha (later the Buddha), who in his last birth went to the ascetics in search of Enlightenment but discarded their teaching.¹⁰³

101. 'tavat noyek aya Buddhāgamaṭa muvāva siṭa gena noyek prayōgavalin lōkayāgen mudal labā ganiti.ē labā gannā mudalvala ganān hilavvak lōkayāṭa nopenvati' Rivirāsa, edited by M. Gunānanda, 8.1.1888.

102. Lakminipahana 9.1.1888.

103. Lakminipahana 11.1.1888.

The paper was intended to be the opponent of the Theosophists. It was a fight between the rays of the sun and the rays of the moon. In the first page of Sarasavi Saṇḍarāsa appeared the words 'The organ of the Buddhists of Ceylon', and Mohoṭṭivattē described his paper as 'The ONLY organ of the Buddhists of Ceylon'. But Mohoṭṭivattē could not do much service here as he died on 21.9.1890 after a long illness.¹⁰⁴

Describing his campaign against the Theosophists Olcott wrote that 'the only result was to weaken his influence, lessen his popularity, and expose himself as a selfish, uncharitable, and pugnacious man'.¹⁰⁵ However, we have evidence to contradict this statement. Mohoṭṭivattē was not a serious scholar and he could not properly cover Theosophy with his criticisms. But his accusations on the activities of the Theosophists were accepted promptly by the Buddhists, although he had to fight a lonely battle as all the others who had helped him during his earlier struggle had now become the obedient admirers of Olcott and his Theosophy. His public lectures were more effective than his writings. Except for the societies founded by Olcott and Powell in 1889,

104. He was suffering from a derangement of the kidneys even on 18.7.1879, according to a letter written by Piyaṛatana nāyaka thera, Śailabimbārāmaya, Doḍandūva.

105. H.S.Olcott, O.D.L., (Third Series), p.407.

none of the other branches formed under the initiative of B.T.S were designated as branches of the Society and the organisers of these associations preferred dissociation from the Theosophists. Dharmōdaya Buddhist Society at Kalutara,¹⁰⁶ Bauddhālōka Society at Vākāḍa,¹⁰⁷ Gñānōdaya Society at Kalutara,¹⁰⁸ Buddhist Society at Negombo,¹⁰⁹ Dharmōdaya Society at Koṭahēna, Sugata Samayābhivardhana Society at Marādana and Punyādhāra Society at Vattēgama were meant for the Buddhists but not for the Buddhist Theosophists. The influence of the Theosophists on the Women's Educational Society (Nāri Śikṣādāna Samāgama), an independent organisation, ruined its future and its purpose. Vāligama Siddhārtha Theosophical Society, the creation of Olcott, took to omitting the term Theosophical from its designation.¹¹⁰

This state of affairs shattered the hopes of the Founder to have a firm foundation in the soil of Ceylon,

106. The Buddhist, Vol. ii, No. 16, (4.4.1890), The National Religion, p. 121.

107. The Buddhist, Vol. ii, No. 32, (1.8.1890), The Women's Educational Society at Vakada, p. 251.

108. The Buddhist, Vol. i, No. 43, (11.10.1889), The Powell's Tour, p. 344.

109. The Buddhist, Vol. iii, No. 11, (6.3.1891), Negombo, p. 88

110. J. B. Daly, The Convention of Buddhist Schools, (1892), Galle, introduction, pp. iv-v.

and the events in India, England and America ¹¹¹ added more dissatisfaction and forced him to tender his resignation thrice during ten years. ¹¹² With the decline of the Theosophical Society in Colombo two futile efforts were made by Olcott to secure the power to control the monks of the Island; eventually the failure of these attempts compelled him to retire permanently from participation in religious activities.

The monastic landlordism in the up-country and the low-country invited the detailed attention of the Theosophists as early as 1884 when they were advocating 'immediate steps to decide the question of Buddhist Temporalities by taking financial matters out of the hands of the priests who by their ordination laws are prohibited from meddling in worldly affairs'. ¹¹³ This constantly repeated incorrect 'Vinaya rule' might have been the result of the teachings of the Rāmañña sect. This impractical knowledge of Buddhism provoked Olcott

111. H.S.Olcott, O.D.L, (First Series), 1895, pp. 394-407,
H.S.Olcott, The Theosophical Movement (1875-1906), (New York), pp. 226-243 and pp. 293-333.
John Murdoch, Theosophy Unveiled, (1885).
John Murdoch, The Theosophic Craze, (Madras), 1894.
John Murdoch, Theosophy Exposed, (Madras) 1893.

112. C. Jinarajadasa, A Golden Book of the Theosophical Society, (1926), p. 223, p. 225, p. 226, describes the events in 1885, 1890 and 1892 respectively.

113. Souvenir- Diamond Jubilee of the Theosophical Society, (1940), unpaginated.

to seek power to control the land endowments of the temples. This was mainly aimed at Siam Nikāya as they were the wealthiest land owners of the country. The Amarapurians had no hereditary lands due to their recent origin. The Rāmaññas who advocated dwellings in the forests, though they had started a migration to the towns, were still in a poor stage. The British administrators were more careful than the Theosophists in handling this complex problem and once declared ' the exercise of any such control by the government officials' was not their aim. Olcott and his wealthy Theosophists were searching for an avenue of easy income to establish schools without sacrificing their own purse. They found the hidden treasure in the temple lands and preached that the removal of lands from the temples was the only way for the purification of the bhikkhus.

Their intention became clearer to everyone when the Buddhist Temporalities Ordinance, No. 3 of 1889 and the Proclamation of 23.8.1889 were introduced in the Legislative Council. Olcott and his supporters got busy selecting commissioners and committees for the districts and provinces,¹¹⁴ who would become the managers when the Bill was implemented. Their support

114. The Buddhist, Vol. ii, No. 42, (10.10.1890), p. 336.
 The Buddhist, Vol. ii, No. 43, (17.10.1890), p. 344.
 The Buddhist, Vol. ii, No. 44, (24.10.1890), p. 352.
 The Buddhist, Vol. ii, No. 45, (31.10.1890), p. 360.

for the implementation indicated that their intention was not so much for the purification of the bhikkhus as to gain the power to manage these lands and to gain control over the landless bhikkhus accordingly.

Unfortunately the Bill did not bring the expected results.¹¹⁵ Most of the members selected to the committees were not Theosophists but the close relatives of the priests.

The bhikkhus of Malvatta and Asgiriya and other wealthy temples became aware of the danger they were facing, and started a 'life and death' struggle against the implementation of the Bill, fully realising the motive of the Theosophists. All the lay Buddhist leaders of the future except Dharmapala engaged in a losing battle with the monks in regard to the Buddhist Temporalities during the next three decades. Olcott and his followers were too hasty to grab the power to control the bhikkhus in the midst of the opposition of the bhikkhus and the intelligent go-slow policy of the Colonial authorities.

We have noted in the last chapter the problems encountered by the priests as a result of the controversies on the alms to the impious and on their impiety. The Theosophists who had been criticising the monks for

115. The Buddhist, Vol. ii, No. 47, (14.11.1890), The Second Annual Convention of the Ceylon Branch of the Theosophical Society, p. 372.

the last two decades aggravated the situation by their criticisms. Their struggle to govern the bhikkhus reached its culmination in 1897, when they exposed their ignorance of Buddhism and of the Order of the community of bhikkhus.

Prisdamchoonsai, a prince of Siam, the cousin of the king of Siam, entered the Order in Ceylon under the teachership of Vaskaḍuvē Subhūti nāyaka thera of the Amarapura sect, and was named Jinavaravamsa. He witnessed how monks were convicted of 'debauchery, embezzlement, the coining of false money and other crimes'. He found himself in an 'atmosphere of personal bickerings, childish sectarian squabbles, ignorance of the world about them and incapacity to fit themselves to the ideals which the Lord Buddha had depicted for the government of his sangha'.¹¹⁶ He corresponded with the high priests and the lay devotees and entertained the idea that he might get their support. His idea was that the loss of a Sangharāja or a king, a religious or a secular monarchy, had caused the deterioration of the monks in Ceylon, and to remedy this a united sect must be constituted including Burma, Siam and Ceylon under the supreme authority of the king of Siam.

116. H.S.Oloctt, O.D.L.(Sixth Series), 1935, (Madras), pp. 154-155.

When the king of Siam visited the Tooth Relic at Kandy, Jinavaravamsa wanted to celebrate the first meeting of the proposed United Sect. The priests of the country criticised the initiative of a 'one-year old' bhikkhu to purify bhikkhus who were older than him. Though he was a royal prince, according to the traditional law his lay position ought to be disregarded as he had renounced the world. Theosophists supported Jinavaravamsa, and this created a general dissatisfaction with Jinavaravamsa, as they advocated in editorials of the Buddhist ¹¹⁷ that after his entering the Order, the bhikkhus of Ceylon could accept him as their spiritual leader. To a person accustomed to the conventions of the Order of bhikkhus in Ceylon this suggestion will seem to show a general wish of the Theosophists to make a very radical change in its structure. But it seems ludicrous to read editorials of this nature while there were bhikkhus of thirty or forty years of age after their Higher Ordination who were asked to obey him. In a society where the eldership is reckoned not according to lay position nor to the date of birth but on the date of receiving upasampadā, this statement about leadership ^{the} shows either/insularity of the Theosophists or their intention to undermine the community of bhikkhus in Ceylon.

117. The Buddhist, Vol. viii, No. 44, (25.12.1896), The Sects of Southern Buddhism, pp. 340-341; Vol. viii, No. 46, (8.1.1897), Notes, pp. 356-357; Vol. viii, No. 49, (29.1.1897), Reform and the Unity of the Ceylon Sangha, pp. 372-374; Vol. viii, No. 50, (5.2.1897), pp. 380-381.

Jinavaravamsa's proposal was absolutely refused by the bhikkhus of the Island. The days of the king's arrival came nearer, and there seemed no hope for his plans. At last Jinavaravamsa submitted a long letter to Olcott on 20.3.1897, and appealed him to visit the country urgently. Olcott came on 23rd and set up a reception committee and drafted an address to be presented to the king on his arrival. At the exhibition of the Tooth Relic to the king he was not allowed the blessing of taking the Relic into his own hands by the guardians of the temple. The king was exasperated and returned all the presents to the high priests, and in Colombo he did not address the gatherings at Kuppiyāvatta and Māligākanda, as advertised.

When the news of the king's anger spread in Colombo, a Theosophical sub-committee was organised on the same day to enquire into the affair and a report was submitted to a public meeting on 2.4.1897 by the three-member committee presided over by Olcott. At the gathering criticisms were levelled against one of the guardians of the temple, T.B. Panabokke, who became the prey of the critics, furious at the shattering of their expectations of a united sect.

This incident had many-fold results in Buddhist society. An irreparable rift sprung up between the new

lay leaders and the community of the Sangha. Secondly this totally futile attempt to establish a United Sect forced Olcott to retire from his public participation in the religious activities of the Island. ¹¹⁸

It is our duty to consider and evaluate the service rendered by the Theosophical movement in the field of religious activities in Ceylon. The vast amount of uncritical and exaggerated literature about it inclined some to attribute every significant event which occurred in the social history of the country to the Theosophists. To sort out the reality from these overstatements poses many difficulties to the student of religious affairs.

The honour for the establishment of Buddhist schools has been generally given to the Theosophical movement, and 'pioneer of Buddhist schools' and 'father of the Buddhist school movement' were titles attributed to Olcott in Ceylon. Nevertheless an investigation of the actual historical evidence will create doubts in our minds. The administration report of the Director of Public Instruction issued for the year 1880 describes the existence of four Buddhist Grant-in-aid schools at

¹¹⁸.C.Jinarajadasa, The Golden Book of the Theosophical Society, (1925), Madras, p.231 reports a mass gathering in Ceylon of 6000 on Temperance addressed by Olcott in 1904. But Sarasavi Saṇḍarāsa, the organ of the Theosophical Society, which supplied detailed descriptions on every insignificant event of the Society only mentions Olcott's stay in Colombo but nothing is said of an address. Sarasavi Saṇḍarāsa, 24.3.1904.

Koratoṭa, Hōmāgama and Haṇḍapāngoḍa in the Western province and at Walahepiṭṭiya in the Northern province.¹¹⁹ The existence of specifically Buddhist schools is recognised for the first time by the department in this year; in earlier reports these schools came under the private aided schools list.

The Diamond Jubilee Souvenir of the Buddhist Theosophical Society speaks of the existence of two Buddhist schools in the Island in 1880, at Doḍandūva and Pānadura. But the report mentioned earlier clearly contradicts this statement. The Koratota school which received its grant in 1872 according to that report, will precisely go back to the year 1869, as three years of successful work was needed to get the grant. In 1869, the existence of another Buddhist school at Dodanduva can be established from literary sources. Realising the danger of Church Missionary schools at Dodanduva, Piyarātana nāyaka thera, after collecting money from the villagers, started 'Jinalabdhi Viśōdhaka school' in 1869.¹²⁰ In response to a petition submitted to the governor, the school was registered under the category A in 1872.¹²¹ According to the administrative report

119. Administrative Report of the Director of Public Instruction, (1880), p. 54.

120. I am grateful to Mr. M. Lokuge, the retired headmaster of this school and Rev. Doḍandūvē Dharmasena for all the informative documents.

121. Jinalabdhi Viśōdhaka School Report, (1902), Doḍandūva, p. 4.

there were two anglo-vernacular schools at Doḍandūva, one under a Christian priest and other under the Mudliar of Vāllabaḍa Pattuva. The existence of this school can be firmly established with the assistance of contemporary newspapers. Lakrivikirana published two letters with regard to this school written by angry Christians.¹²² The contemporary Wesleyan Missionary reports too establish the existence of this Buddhist school at Doḍandūva.¹²³ The Buddhist, organ of the B.T.S, mentioned three Buddhist schools which existed in 1869, at Dangedara,¹²⁴ Pānadura,¹²⁵ and Doḍandūva.¹²⁶ So as far as Buddhist schools are concerned we can definitely say that they were not the creation of Olcott and we are certain that seven anglo-vernacular Buddhist schools were already functioning in the Island at the time of the arrival of Olcott.

Olcott devoted his energy to organising and continuing the existing Buddhist schools movement. There are many reports regarding opening of schools in every Theosophical source. One will therefore be amazed to read that the

122. Lakrivikirana, 4.6.1869 and 9.10.1869.

123. M.M.S Box (1868-1876), Letter written by J. Scott on 6.6.1872.

124. The Buddhist, Vol. iv, No. 40, (7.10.1892), Dangedara Buddhist School, p. 317.

125. The Buddhist, Vol. ii, No. 28, (4.7.1890), Buddhist Activities, p. 224.

126. The Buddhist, Vol. iv, No. 5, (29.1.1892), Buddhist Items, p. 39.

Society after ten years of ill planned, haphazard work was only able to run six schools of their own.¹²⁷ The establishment of a Buddhist school was synonymous with a government grant. Managers and societies sprung up overnight to establish schools and to get a government grant. 'A crafty set of men are striving to make a trade of school management. Teachers' salaries are in arrears. Managers have squandered the money and closed the schools. One manager stocked two boutiques by making a commercial use of education funds. Olcott was accused of misappropriating money by the public of Galle. The brother of the President of the Society was also accused on the same charge and the President of the Colombo branch could not provide the public their accounts for nine years'.¹²⁸

The schools were not systematically run.¹²⁹ There was no difference between the education received at the Christian school and one of these so-called Buddhist schools. The curriculum was the same, and slavishly

127. J.B. Daly, The Convention of Buddhist Schools, (1891), p. 12. According to a certified statement of H.S. Olcott on 2. 8. 1893, in 1893 there were in Ceylon, 4 registered girls' vernacular schools, and 4 boys' and 5 English schools. The Theosophical Congress Held by the Theosophical Society, (1893), p. 91.

128. *ibid*, p. 13 and p. 25.

129. The Buddhist, Vol. v, No. 42, (3. 11. 1893), Panadura Buddhist School, p. 332; Vol. vi, No. 1, (12. 1. 1894), pp. 1-4; Vol. vi, No. 2, (19. 1. 1894), p. 16.

imitated the missionary schools. In missionary schools at least the Buddhist children were taught Christianity, but what amazes us is that there was no religious education given in these Buddhist schools. Though they advocated Buddhist religious education, and designated the schools as Buddhist schools, no Buddhism was taught to the children. 'The books employed in these schools' wrote the General manager of the Buddhist Schools in 1891 'are unsuited to the children ... and utterly contrary to the precepts of Buddhism'.¹³⁰ Thus the so-called Buddhist school movement of the Theosophists brought actual harm to the country and disappointed the expectations of ordinary Buddhists.

The Buddhist clergy was obsolete in its relationship to the religious and social needs of the ordinary Buddhists. Scholarship was low among the priests and religious observances were unattractive to the illiterate laymen. On Poya days sermons were held at temples but the listeners did not react much to these lengthy uninteresting readings. These sermons dragged on for three hours or more, which encouraged the audience to chew betel and sleep while the priest read.¹³¹

¹³⁰. J.B. Daly, op.cit, p.13.

Dharmapala Hevavitarana, one time the manager of the Buddhist schools of the Society, criticised this policy in 1906.

¹³¹. ibid, p.11.

Ordinary Buddhists had little knowledge even of the life story of the Master, let alone of the principles of his religion.¹³² Reading from a book was the accepted way of preaching sermons.¹³³ The Theosophists, including Olcott, C.W. Leadbeater, J. Bowles Daly and Annie Besant delivered lectures on Buddhist subjects, limited their 'sermons' (dēśanāva) to one hour and never read from books. Listening to them was a comfortable experience when compared to the soporific sermons of the monks. The priests started to imitate this way of delivering lectures and thus brought a suitable modern system of preaching to the ordinary Buddhists, which is followed even today.

The motive of Theosophy was to encourage people to explore the philosophy of ancient religions, though their aims are very vague. The rational approach which they were attempting to introduce for Buddhism was highly commendable and it could have been the great service rendered by the Theosophists, if they had done it systematically and kept to their ideals. But it was an illtimed aim. The majority of the Buddhists were unaware of the simple elements of Buddhism, so what

132. J.B. Daly, op.cit, p.12.

133. Even in the early twentieth century it prevailed in some areas where the Theosophists did not exert their influence says Kalukoṇḍayāvē nāyaka priest. K. Pragnāsēkhara, Svayamlikhita Śrī Pragnāsēkhara Caritāpadānaya, (1970), p.75.

service could be done with a purely rationalistic approach? The Theosophists abandoned their earlier plans in this field when they arrived in Ceylon.

The Theosophists were the first after the British domination to attempt to restore the position of religion in the national context. They advocated the restoration of lively links between Buddhism and the Sinhalese nation. Annie Besant, the President of the Society, summed up the ideals in this statement in 1908, at Ananda College.

"Can you imagine a Sinhalese people without Buddhism? Buddhism builded this people up into a nation and trained its thought. You could not live without it ".¹³⁴
 "On Buddhism you must build your nationality".¹³⁵

A resolution was passed by the Society to organise a movement to restore Aryan names instead of the Western names the Sinhalese had been bearing. The members unanimously agreed on 17.4.1885, a list of Aryan names was published, and they decided to publish the name changes in their newspaper. ¹³⁶ The European preacher, C.W. Leadbeater, during his lectures stressed the

134. Annie Besant, Buddhist Popular Lectures, (Madras), 1908, p.6.

135. ibid, p.24.

136. Decennial Report of the Theosophical Society, (1890), pp.43-44.

necessity for re-adopting Sinhalese names, and he sometimes added certain Sinhalese customs to the subject.¹³⁷ But except for H.D.David, the manager of the Buddhist press at the time, we do not come across any member of the Society who practised according to their advice. H.D.David changed his name and was introduced as Dharmapala Hevavitarana, in 1886.

The Sinhalese were then imitating the costumes of the westerns, though they wore not only the trouser but a cloth over the trouser. They were in search of a national dress for men and women. They were conscious of an original association with the Indians and therefore advocated as the easier dress a 'dōti' for men and 'sāri' for women. Dharmapala delivered many lectures on these national cultural aspects, which we will discuss in detail later. It was unfortunate that the leaders of this movement could not accurately prescribe the necessary adaptations between traditional Buddhism and the modern Sinhalese nation, which was a matter which gave rise to a great diversity of opinions.

A more effective service rendered by the Theosophists in the religious field was the organised social acceptance of the official proclamation of a public

137. Supplement to the Theosophist, Vol. vii, No. 83, (August 1886), pp. cxlv-cxlvii.

holiday on the Vesak day. It may be argued that this was not the direct outcome of the efforts of the B.T.S but arose out of a subordinate committee of the Society. The causes for the formation of the Buddhist Defence Committee have to be discussed before analysing the results of the committee.

At Dipaduttamārāma temple, Koṭahēna, a religious festival was arranged in January 1883, to mark the 'setting of the eyes (nētra tābīmē pinkama) of the reclining figure of Lord Buddha' erected in the new image house. Mohoṭṭivattē Gunānanda, the chief incumbent of the temple, announced that the 'reciting of Pirit and preaching of Bana will continue until the thirtyfirst of March, on which the procession carrying eight requisites to the five hundred bhikkhus who participated in the ceremony will take place'. 138

Meanwhile arrangements were made to bring the morning meal (hīl dāne) and the midday meal (daval dāne) for nearly fifty monks from various villages around Koṭahēna, and the meals were brought to the temple every day in processions by the villagers. St. Lucia's Cathedral, the Church of the Roman Catholics, was situated in the close vicinity of the Buddhist temple. The sentiments expressed by the Catholics at that time on Buddhist

processions were that they were nothing but 'a farce' or 'mere nonsense'.¹³⁹ These 'farcical' processions which proceeded every day to the temple past the cathedral, must have irritated the feelings of the Roman Catholics.

The acting Inspector General of Police issued a general permission to the Buddhists to hold the processions in the month of March. The priests of the Roman Catholic Church contacted the Superintendent of Police in the Western Province to get the licence to have their own festivals from Palm Sunday to Easter Sunday, and this was also granted. Though it was not intended by the Police to embarrass any group this stupid act aroused the feelings of both parties, and the Buddhists were more vigorous in challenging the Catholics. The permission given to Buddhists to have a procession on Good Friday was withdrawn by the Police on the previous day, but the angry Catholics without knowing of the last minute cancellation gathered at St. Anthony's church, Koccikadē, expecting trouble. The Buddhists pressed to have their procession on the twentyfifth of March, Easter Sunday, instead of Good Friday.¹⁴⁰ The Bishop of Colombo agreed with the Police to issuing a permission to the Buddhists for Sunday after twelve p.m.

139. The Theosophist, Vol. 4, No. 9, (June 1883), Madras, What is a Perahara?, p. 236.

140. The Theosophist, Vol. 4, No. 8, (May 1883), Theosophy and Religious Riots, pp. 197-200.

The Buddhists were alleged to have carried figures in their processions which ridiculed the Virgin Mary and other sacred symbols. The Assistant Superintendent of Police, a Roman Catholic, went to Borälla, the starting place of the procession, examined it and saw 'nothing of any objectionable nature'. The procession of the Buddhists approached Skinner's Road. 'A little before 1 o'clock a sudden and violent ringing of bells in the cathedral was followed by all the Roman Catholic churches. Catholics with weapons and clubs in hands and marks of crosses on their back and forehead assembled at the cathedral,' to defend themselves. A rumour reached the Buddhist procession of an assault on a Buddhist monk and the silent Buddhists suddenly became violent attackers heavily armed with sticks and weapons.

The Police could do nothing and the military was called ⁱⁿ for the restoration of peace and order. 'One Buddhist was mortally wounded and thirty others were seriously injured'. The legal procedure was dangerously hampered by the difference of opinion and the inefficiency between the Police and the department of the Queen's advocate.¹⁴¹ The Riots Commission appointed by the

141. C.O. 54-548, Despatch No. 66 dated 24.8.1883 and No. 306 dated 26.6.1883 by the governor Longdon to the Earl of Derby.

governor submitted him a report-hardly impartial- on the events, criticising the 'indiscretion and indecision of the Police' in granting a licence for processions.

The Police did not take action legally against the guilty Christians, alleged the Buddhists, while the Christians criticised the policy of the Queen's advocate for releasing the Buddhist offenders. Buddhists and Christians equally believed that this was injustice and the Buddhists submitted a petition to the Colonial Secretary through Edward Francis Perera, a proctor. The Colonial government without considering their grievance introduced new laws to suppress the Buddhist processions. ¹⁴² Meanwhile the priests of the Siamese and Amarapura sects agreed to have a spokesman (konsalvarayek) in the name of the king of Siam, since the British government was not interested in Ceylon Buddhists. Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala, Dhammāḷankāra and Vaskaḍuvē Subhūti met the governor in regard to the employment of traditional instrumentalists in the Buddhist processions, and on their return to the temples were met by two proctors and members of the B.T.S, at N.S.Fernando's shop. But the lay Theosophists declined the invitation of the priests to have a delegate in the name of a king when they already had efficient speakers on behalf of

142.C.O. 54-548, Despatch No.9 of 14.7.1883.

Buddhism.¹⁴³ They secretly invited Olcott to Ceylon.

The trained minds of the Theosophists quickly realised the importance of the situation. Olcott came to Māligākanda on 27.1.1884 and a discussion was held with regard to the redress of injustice^{caused} in the riots, with Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala in the chair; and the twelve members¹⁴⁴ present acquired a semi-official status after the formation of the Buddhist Defence Committee (Buddhārakṣaka Sabhāva) on the next day. Olcott represented the Committee at the Colonial Secretary's office in London. The employment of the instrumentalists¹⁴⁵ in the processions and the redress of injustice to the Buddhists were the primary aims of the Committee. But the appointment of Buddhist registrars of marriages and births and the declaration of Vesak as a public holiday were among other demands. Olcott submitted these demands of the Buddhists on 27.May 1884.

143.Y.Paṇṇānanda, op.cit, Vol.ii, A letter written by Sumangala on 27.10.1883 to E.R.Gunaratna, pp.722-724.

144.H.S.Olcott, William De Abrew, Don Karolis, Don David Abhayaratana, S.P.Jayatilaka, J.R.De Silva, S.P. Dharmagunavardhana, B.H.Kure, Seditis Silva, R.A.Mirando, Charles Alexander De Silva, C.P.Gunavardhana.

145.During processions organisers employed a group of drummers with Davul, Tammāṭṭam, Purappaṭṭu and a Horāṇā player. This group is called 'Hēvisi'. The drummers with Yak Bera or Gāṭa Bera are added at Pirit chanting ceremonies.

From this point onwards we have to be more careful in the Theosophical records.¹⁴⁶ Not only Olcott but his followers too employed every attempt to grant to Olcott the sole credit for the declaration of Vesak as a holiday. But we could look at the picture from a different angle with the records of the Legislative Council in Ceylon. Olcott met Lord Derby in London, a few days after the Vesak Fullmoon day in 1884. On 17th December 1884 the Council discussed the Ordinance to provide for public and bank holidays.¹⁴⁷ The Sinhalese New year Festival on April thirteenth and fourteenth competed here with Vesak Fullmoon day during the debate. But the Governor was adamant on accepting the Vesak day, despite the opposition of the Sinhalese representative. The governor, Sir Arthur Gordon, was accepted as a 'friend' ¹⁴⁸ of the Buddhists, and in 1884 he had sent a circular to the high priests and the lay Buddhists to decide the day for a public holiday and he declared that most preferred the Vesak. If this has happened in 1884, can not we say that the existing idea of a

146. The Theosophist introduced the events under the title 'Theosophy and the Religious Riots' and interpreted everything as the result of Theosophy. The Theosophist, Vol. 4, No. 8, (May 1883), pp. 197-200, and p. 205; Vol. 5, No. 11, (August 1884), p. 261. The Buddhist, Vol. viii, No. 16, (12.6.1896), p. 114; No. 17, (19.6.1896), p. 125; No. 20, (10.7.1896), p. 145.

147. The Ceylon Hansard, (1885-1886), pp. 84-85.

148. He was presented with an address in Pali and Sinhalese by the Buddhists in 1890. The Buddhist, Vol. 2, No. 23, (30.5.1890), p. 182; No. 24, (6.6.1890), pp. 191-192.

Vesak holiday was supported by the newly formed Committee, which they already knew would be a success? They were aware of the advantages of pressing a demand of the Buddhists.

The Sinhalese Buddhists expressed their views through the Tamil representative, Sir P.Ramanathan, who read a letter of Sumangala in the Council in which he mentioned that the Buddhists had observed the Vesak in 1884 as a holiday, and 'their unanimous appeal is for the Birth day and not the New Year'. If the Buddhists had a reaction of this nature in 1884, it is indubitably certain that the declaration of Vesak as a holiday was not only the result of Olcott's delegation, which he made after the Vesak . . of 1884. The Holidays Bill was passed in the Council in 1885, and the 28.4.1885 was the first officially recognised public holiday after the time of the Sinhalese kings. The proclamation of Vesak in 1885 'gave hardly any time to the Buddhist public to celebrate'.¹⁴⁹ What does the Buddhist, organ of the B.T.S, mean by these words? Were not the Buddhist public ^{the} in/habit of celebrating the Vesak prior to 1885? We have evidence in the missionary records of the celebrations of ordinary Buddhists even three decades earlier than 1885.

149. Supplement to the Theosophist, Vol. 7, No. 81, (June 1886), p. cxxxiii.

'Within the last few weeks the roads about Colombo have been thronged with pilgrims going to the celebrated temple at Callany' reported Rev.J.Scott to the general secretaries in London 'to honour the month in which Buddha was born'.¹⁵⁰ Nobody could deny that these simple celebrations occurred among ordinary village Buddhists, and that may have been the cause for the selection of Kālaniya by the Theosophists on 13.May 1881, the Vesak day, to inaugurate the Education Fund.

The official recognition of Vesak as a public holiday was not the outcome of the delegation of Olcott made to the Colonial Secretary, but the inevitable consequences of the circumstances. The Theosophists took advantage of the position and determined to carry the Vesak celebrations along modern lines. The six-coloured Buddhist flag, the symbol of the Buddhists, was jointly designed by John Robert De Silva and Olcott,¹⁵¹ and the prints of it were imported from Japan by N.S.Fernando. The official recognition of Vesak was received with warm hearts, and an organised Vesak festival was held in Colombo on 17.May 1886, on a grand scale. After witnessing the celebrations Sumangala telegraphed Olcott

150.M.M.S,Box vii,File 1856-1857,Letter dated 11.6.1857 to Rev.E.Hoole by Rev. J.Scott.

151.The Buddhist,Supplement to Sarasavi Saṇḍarāsa,(1888),p.7.

and congratulated him on the success,¹⁵² which he assumed to be Olcott's doing.

By that time the Christmas celebrations in Colombo had severely affected the social life of the Sinhalese Buddhists, and they acted no differently from the Christians in celebrating from December twentyfifth to January second. The Theosophists were in need of a grand exhibition of religious spirit in Colombo. Unfortunately to achieve this end the existing 'offerings of principles' (pratipatti pūjā) in a simple manner were hardly adequate. But a storeroom of readymade celebration plans was at the disposal of the Buddhists. For years, they had witnessed the decorations among the Christians, on the Christmas day. 'The decorations on the streets and houses, Christmas lamps, pandals depicting the life of Jesus, tolling of bells, evergreens, and carol parties' ¹⁵³ supplied the pattern needed. Unimaginatively, the Theosophists imitated these practices and consequently 'christianised' the Vesak festival. Pandals were erected with scenes from the life of Buddha. Roads were decorated with evergreens. Colourful lanterns were imported from Japan and China. The inhibitions exhibited

152. Supplement to the Theosophist, Vol. 7, No. 81, (June 1886), p. cxxxiii.

153. Ceylon Friend, Vol. ii, No. 61, (16.10.1889), p. 94.

by the Theosophists on music,¹⁵⁴ especially on the Hindusthani musical system,¹⁵⁵ discouraged them from adopting carol parties at the beginning though they were badly in need of spectacular entertainment. C.W. Leadbeater came to the rescue and songs were composed along the lines of Christian hymns in English and Sinhalese, and trained parties went round accompanied by western musical instruments.

"After a final practice ... the carolling party started from Theosophical Society headquarters, at 11.30 p.m. It consisted of the headquarters staff, some prominent members of the Society and twenty two boys with a cornet, a violin and a harmonium by way of accompaniment to the voices"¹⁵⁶

The organised religious festival of Vesak in 1886 impressed the minds of ordinary Buddhists, and the impact was echoed in the hearts of the members of the B.T.S, but they could not divert their energy to organise and develop the religious sentiments of the Buddhists more permanently. There emerged doubts in regard to the correctness of the Vesak day among the Buddhists. This was highlighted in 1892, when the Vesak was declared in the month of April, in the

154. Editors of the Buddhist and Sarasavi Saṅḍarāsa discouraged music in their writings while in India Theosophy has encouraged it.
The Theosophist, Vol. 4, No. 1, (October 1882), pp. 11-12.
The Theosophist, Vol. 4, No. 11, (August 1883), pp. 265-266.

155. The Buddhist, Vol. 1, No. 22, (3rd Ave Vesak 2433), pp. 172-3.

156. The Theosophist, Vol. 7, No. 84, (September 1886), The Wesak Festival, p. 738.

government almanac. It was believed that this was prescribed by Sumangala nāyaka thera; nevertheless the Vesak in April was named as 'the wrong Vesak' (mithyadrstika Vesak) and the Vesak in May as 'the correct Vesak' (Samyakdrstika Vesak). By that time, the power and the enthusiasm of the Theosophists had diminished, but the ordinary Buddhists followed the celebrations without any difference. However, the doubts and discussions on the 'correctness' of Vesak affected the minds of the Sinhalese Buddhists,¹⁵⁷ and soemtimes they tended to select the fixed, uncontroversial dates of Christmas and 'Janēru' as the days of celebrations instead of - or at least as well as - the doubtful Vesak. The Sinhalese newspaper editors made many attempts to bring them back,¹⁵⁸ but scarcely influenced their minds.

During the five years which started in 1890, many attempts were launched by Sinhalese Buddhist Theosophists to continue the practices of the Western Theosophists in Ceylon. They delivered lectures on religious education, on national culture, against beef eating, smoking and taking opium. The officials examined the schools constantly. All these activities were done without planning and this untiring devotion to the Theosophy was hardly of any service. D.S.S. Wickramaratna, D.J. Subasinha, G.P. Wirasekara,
157. Kalyāṇodaya, 15.5.1893.

158. Sarasavi Saṇḍarāsa, 29.3.1892; 23.12.1892; 16.12.1892.
 Lakminipahana, 10.5.1892; 13.5.1892.

R.De Fonseka,D.N.D.S.Wickramasuriya,R.J.Fernando,G.
Vimalasuriya,C.P.Goonawardana,D.D.Wirasinha,Veragama
Puncibanda and G.Dhammapala of Kurunagala were the names
of those itinerant preachers who succeeded the European
Theosophists.

The appearance of Dharmapala Hevavitarana on the
scene overshadowed the fame of these preachers, and by
1895 Dharmapala reached the status of the most influential
Sinhalese Buddhist leader in the history of religion
during the century. His service and activities in the
religious field, though they sound indigenous in
outlook, like the Western Theosophy, have not been
" subjected to a critical study. This has caused a great
misunderstanding and invited misinterpretations on his
service. Only an analysis of his religious concepts
will throw some light on his career. In order to
understand his religious activities we have to study
his association with Theosophy first.

Dharmapala was sixteen years when the Theosophists
first visited the Island. He was one of the listeners
to Olcott's first lecture in Colombo, and on the same day
was introduced to the founders of Theosophy by his
father and uncle. 'I was drawn to Madame Blavatsky

intuitively' wrote Dharmapala during his last hours.¹⁵⁹ After the riots at Kōṭahēna, in 1883, he was forced to leave his Catholic school by his father and used to spend his time at the Pettah Library. In the Theosophist he read an article by Blavatsky entitled 'Chelas and Lay Chelas'¹⁶⁰ and later he took an interest in Sinnett's 'Occult World' and determined to communicate with Blavatsky and seek admission to the 'Himalayan School of Adepts (Mahatma)'. In November 1883, he addressed a letter to the 'unknown Himalayan adept' through Madame Blavatsky.¹⁶¹ When Olcott visited the Island in 1884, to form the Buddhist Defence Committee, he expressed his wish to become a member of the B.T.S. His grandfather being the President of the Society and the Chairman of the Buddhist Defence Committee, and the father being an influential member of the Society and

159. Most of the materials regarding Dharmapala's career are taken from the 'Reminiscences of My Early Life', published in the Mahabodhi Journal, Vol. 41, (May-June 1933) posthumously. He died on 29.4.1933 and could not continue the article.

160. Supplement to the Theosophist, Vol. 4, No. 10, (July 1883), pp. 10-11. Reproduced the same in The Buddhist, Vol. ii, No. 18, (25.4.1890), pp. 140-141.

161. In Tibet there exists an abode of Adepts who will select the Chelas, who have offered themselves to such Masters as pupils to learn practically the 'hidden mysteries of Nature and the psychical powers latent in men'. This is the belief of the Theosophists. A Mahatma or Adept is an individual who by special training and education has developed higher faculties and attained the spiritual knowledge. Blavatsky is accepted as the liaison between the Adepts and Chelas.

the Committee, his application could not be rejected though he was under age. His application was sanctioned by the Founder and in his twentieth year, in 1884, he became a member of the Theosophical Society, and entered the path to gain an apprenticeship as a Mahatma.

In the month of December, despite his parent's and relatives' opposition he accompanied Blavatsky to Adyar, in search of Adepts. His ambition to contact the 'unknown brother' through her could not be fulfilled since she advised him not to study Occultism but Pali. The stay in India was not necessary to learn Pali, as the Pali College of Vidyodaya was under the principalship of his friend, and he returned to Ceylon.

In November 1885, he witnessed the deteriorating situation of the B.T.S in Colombo, and intending to devote his time to the welfare of the Society he left his father's luxurious mansion in Pettah and took up residence at the office room of the Buddhist Press where Sarasavi Saṇḍarāsa, the Sinhalese newspaper of the Society, was printed, and consequently became the manager of the Press. He was a dedicated member of the Society, and without other's help he packed the newspapers, wrote the addresses and posted them to the subscribers.

When Olcott came with Leadbeater in 1886 to collect the money for the Education Fund none of the other members of the Society was ready to leave their families and accompany them. Dharmapala, the only bachelor, resigned his day-time job at the Department of Public Instruction as a junior clerk, and joined them as their interpreter.

In the next five years we are able to note the sincerity and devotion extended by Dharmapala to the Society, where he tendered his services as the interpreter to all the European Theosophists till 1890, and as the manager of the Buddhist Press, manager of the Buddhist schools, and the assistant general secretary of the Society.

Dharmapala's achievements can be considered as unique among the Buddhist leaders. He was the youngest member of the B.T.S, youngest manager of the Buddhist Press, youngest and the only Sinhalese manager of the Buddhist schools, the first Sinhalese to set his foot upon the shores of Japan, and the most sought after interpreter by the Western Theosophists. His success in these fields, in the very short time of four years, established him as a prospective leader of the religion. At the Second Convention of the Ceylon branches of the B.T.S held in Kandy in 1890, Dharmapala represented the

branches of Mātara, Dikvālla and Vāligama,¹⁶² and in the Colombo Convention he represented the Colombo, Trincomalee and Galle branches.¹⁶³ This participation signified the final duty of an ardent member of the Theosophy, in the company of the Theosophists in Ceylon. For the first time he started a lecture tour of his own around Colombo on 'national religion' and at the end of 1890,¹⁶⁴ he left the country in order to participate in the Convention at Adyar. During his sojourn in India he visited the ancient Buddhist shrines.

Meditating in front of ^{the} Bodhi tree, under which Lord Buddha had attained Enlightenment in Buddhagaya, he 'made a vow to surrender his life to rescue the Holy place from neglect'.¹⁶⁵ Dharmapala in an article contributed to the Buddhist described the lamentable position of 'Buddhagaya and its surroundings'¹⁶⁶ and

162. The Buddhist, Vol. ii, No. 47, (14.11.1890), Theosophical and Buddhist News, p. 369.

163. The Buddhist, Vol. ii, No. 8, (7.2.1890), p. 63.

164. The Buddhist, Vol. ii, No. 52, (19.12.1890), p. 416.

165. Diary of Dharmapala, (2.1.1891).

166. The Buddhist, Vol. iii, No. 23, (29.5.1891), pp. 179-184.

determined to fulfill the wishes of Sir Edwin Arnold,¹⁶⁷ though not exactly as he prescribed but in a different way.

On his return to the Island on the 31.May 1891, he convened a meeting of wealthy Buddhists in regard to the Sacred shrines in India, and the 'Buddhagayā Mahābōdhi Society' was founded at Māligākanda.¹⁶⁸ The objects of the Society were to 'gain possession of the Buddhist sites in India, to disseminate His teachings throughout the world, to gain young men as Buddhist missionaries for foreign propaganda, to found a Pali and Sanskrit college at Calcutta and to erect monasteries at Buddhagaya, Benares, Kusinara and Kapilavastu'.¹⁶⁹ Before leaving for India, Dharmapala addressed four meetings at Kalutara, Galle, Mātara and Kandy and collected one thousand rupees for the Fund.¹⁷⁰ His

167. In a letter to the Governor of India in 1886 Sir Edwin Arnold, the author of *Light of Asia*, requested 'the transfer of the Buddhagaya temple and its grounds to the guardianship of Buddhist monks from Ceylon, and to establish a Buddhist college'.
The Buddhist, Vol.i, No.37, (30.8.1889), p.292.

168. The Buddhist, Vol.iv, No.5, (29.1.1892), Buddha-Gaya Maha Bodhi Society, p.40.

169. The Buddhist, Vol.v, No.13, (31.3.1893), p.104.
In every issue of The Buddhist these objects of the M.B.S were published for nearly two years.

170. The Buddhist, Vol.iv, No.7, (12.2.1892), pp.53-55.

popularity among the Buddhists is indicated by this collection when it is compared with the Fund of Olcott. The ordinary Buddhists by that time described Dharmapala as a 'Sanyāsi'.¹⁷¹

He formed a branch of the Mahabodhi Society in Burma and published the 'Mahābōdhi Patrikā' ¹⁷² promising that 'active operations' would be launched after May 1892, and printed the 'Mahabodhi Journal' in June.¹⁷³

While Dharmapala was active in Buddhagaya, despite petty differences with the members of the B.T.S, his name was approved by the Buddhist public as the representative of Southern Buddhism in the World Parliament of Religions at Chicago.¹⁷⁴ His illustrious lecture at Chicago boosted him to the summit of popularity; the newspaper cuttings of his lecture were displayed at the headquarters of the B.T.S with a photograph of Dharmapala, and the Sinhalese translations of the reports were published in the Sarasavi Saṇḍarāsa.¹⁷⁵

171. The Buddhist, Vol. iii, No. 23, Buddhagaya and its Surroundings, (29.5.1891), p. 179.

172. The Buddhist, Vol. iv, No. 12, (18.3.1892), Mr. Dharmapala's Lecture at Rangoon, p. 95.

173. The Buddhist, Vol. iv, No. 23, (10.6.1892), The Maha-Bodhi Society, pp. 180-181.

174. The Buddhist, Vol. v, No. 27, (21.7.1893), The Buddhist Delegate to Chicago, p. 214.

175. The Buddhist, Vol. v, No. 39, (13.10.1893), p. 308.

On his arrival back in Colombo, on the 27th February 1894, he was respectfully received by the members of the Society and was taken in procession to Māligākanda, where he was presented with an address from the Buddhists of Ceylon.¹⁷⁶ During his short stay in Ceylon (February 28- March 23) he delivered lectures on his project at Maha Bodhi village, and appointed lay trustees for the Fund.¹⁷⁷

Thus he started a busy life in 'India and Ceylon'. On 22. August 1894, he started a lecture tour throughout the country¹⁷⁸ stressing the declining situation at the sacred shrines in India, and the lectures were illustrated with slides depicting 'the birthplace of Siddhartha, His attainment of Buddhahood, preaching the First Discourse, His death, Maha-Bodhi Temple, Benares and Kusinara' projected with a magic lantern.¹⁷⁹ During a period of four months he covered the whole Island with his lectures, and that was the first time a Buddhist leader had travelled throughout the country addressing the Buddhists of the country on one subject.

176. The Buddhist, Vol. vi, No. 8, (2.3.1894), p. 62.

177. The Buddhist, Vol. vi, No. 12, (30.3.1894), p. 96.

178. The Buddhist, Vol. vi, No. 33, (31.8.1894), p. 264.
 ,, ,, , Vol. vi, No. 35, (14.9.1894), p. 280.
 ,, ,, , Vol. vi, No. 36, (21.9.1894), p. 282.
 ,, ,, , Vol. vi, No. 37, (28.9.1894), p. 296.
 ,, ,, , Vol. vi, No. 39, (12.10.1894), p. 307.
 ,, ,, , Vol. vi, No. 45, (22.11.1894), p. 356.

179. The Buddhist, Vol. vi, No. 33, (31.8.1894), p. 264.

The year 1895 marked the turning point of his life and in the month of October, he entered the self-innovated religious 'Order' of 'Anagārika Brahmācāri'. From 1895 to 1906 his life and activities were largely confined to India and other foreign countries in Asia and Europe, except for a few short visits he made to Ceylon. Even these short visits created a strong impact on the minds of the Buddhists and established his position as the most influential Buddhist leader in the field of religion.

His new 'order' and his astounding popularity created a bitter rivalry between the Founder of the Society and Anagārika Dharmapala. Olcott once commented on his dissociation from the Mahabodhi Society;

"The Maha-Bodhi scheme was blocked by a bitter and very costly lawsuit between Dharmapala and the Mahant, and sometime subsequently, having become dissatisfied with the former's management, I severed my connection with the Maha-Bodhi Society and left him to carry it on alone".¹⁸⁰

But the decennial report of the M.B.S written by Dharmapala submits us more evidence of a different character concerning this dispute. In 1895, Olcott discouraged Dharmapala from pursuing the 'great Maha-Bodhi case' against the Mahant,¹⁸¹ and threatened the closure of the M.B.S. Dharmapala was asked to leave

180. H.S. Olcott, Old Diary Leaves, (Fifth Series), (January 1893-April 1896), Madras, 1932, p. 7.

181. D. Hevavitarana, The Decennial Report of the Maha-Bodhi Society, (1902), p. 30.

Adyar, the headquarters of the Theosophical Society, if he was determined to continue Buddhist activities while residing there.¹⁸² All these reactions were the first signs of disagreement between a Theosophist and a Buddhist. The engagement of a Theosophist solely in Buddhist affairs would undoubtedly embarrass the Hindus in India, though they were taught of the 'Universal Truth'.¹⁸³ These signs of dissatisfaction came to light when Olcott secretly signed the document with the advocate of the Mahant promising the 'handover of the Burmese temple, the removal of the Japanese Buddhist image and the bhikkhus and the charge of one panam from the Buddhists on entering the temple'.¹⁸⁴ These secret events which were totally contradictory to his intentions infuriated Dharmapala. An unacceptable role was played by Olcott, after this event, in Colombo. At a meeting held on 20.May 1896, he criticised Dharmapala's foolish activities in Buddhagaya to gain the possession of the Mahant's property, who had owned it for more than seven hundred years. After predicting Dharmapala's 'inability' as a 'youth' in this movement

182.Sinhala Bauddhaya, edited by D.Hevavitarana, 6.10.1906.

183.The Founder of Arya Samaj criticised the connexions of the Theosophists with Buddhism in Ceylon and finally resigned.

184.D.Hevavitarana, Decennial Report of the Mahabodhi Society, pp.29-30.

184.

he discouraged the wealthy members from participation.¹⁸⁵ However, this lecture did not impress the minds of the audience and eventually he resigned from the Mahabodhi Society. Olcott could not face the Indian admirers of the Theosophy which teaches the 'Universal Brotherhood in every religion', when one of the ardent Theosophists under the directorship of Olcott, was making attempts to secure the temple of the Saivites for Buddhism. While living with the parents of Dharmapala at this time in Colombo, Olcott frightened the mother of Dharmapala, by informing her that if she wished to see her son alive she must bring him back to Ceylon.¹⁸⁶

These circumstances altered the faithful disciple into a distant friend. However, after this event also Dharmapala identified himself as a 'disciple of Mahatma K.H.',¹⁸⁷ through Blavatsky, though he had already proclaimed as 'Anagārika Brahmācāri'. In 1904, Dharmapala saw a picture of the Tooth Relic under a shelf in Olcott's room and criticised his neglect.¹⁸⁸ Olcott's

185. This lecture was reproduced in *Sinhala Baudhdhaya*, edited by Raja Ekanayaka, on 10.10.1971 and 17.10.1971.

186. D. Hevavitarana, op.cit, p.31.

187. 'Reminiscences of My Early Life', by D. Hevavitarana, in *Return to Righteousness*, edited by Ananda Guruge, (1965), p.703. *Diary of Dharmapala*, 8.2.1903. Master K.H. can be Koot Hoomi, whose appearance has been often mentioned in the Theosophical literature.

188. idem, pp.29-30.

anger which had been restrained for years found an outlet in counter-criticism. This brought Dharmapala the freedom to act independently. His separation from the Founder did not provide him with ^a good standing among the members of the B.T.S in Ceylon, but he was venerated by the ordinary Buddhists. The new lay leaders excluded him from their activities.¹⁸⁹ To propagate 'pure Buddhism' he started his newspaper, 'Sinhala Bauddhayā', the organ of the Sinhalese Buddhists, on 7. May 1906 and launched a campaign against the Theosophists.

One existing Buddhist paper, after criticising the propagandist literature of the Theosophists, congratulated Dharmapala for deserting Theosophy.¹⁹⁰ The other Buddhist paper, that of the Theosophists, ridiculed the attempts of Dharmapala in publishing 'Sinhala Bauddhayā' and the editor wondered whether he was in search of avenues to spend the wealth which he had received from his father.¹⁹¹

During the time Dharmapala spent ^{with} his activities in India, three Buddhist associations were founded by

189. He was not given the membership of the newly formed organisations and was debarred from 'Amadyapāna Mahā Sangamaya' which has channelled the enthusiasm of all the associations in this century.

190. Lakminipahana, 12. May 1906.

191. Kavaṭṭa Katikayā, 15. May 1906.

the leaders of religion. Except for the Anuradhapura Maha-Bodhi Society, it seems likely that these societies were formed with the direct intention of working against the leadership of Dharmapala in the religious field.

The Young Men's Buddhist Association was founded in March 1898, by D.B.Jayatilaka, an admirer of Theosophy. The reports of the establishment and the activities ¹⁹² of a similar organisation among the students of Japan may have inspired Jayatilaka to form an imitative Association in Ceylon. The main aim was the 'study and the propagation of Buddhism', like that of the Japanese Association. The membership which was limited to the 'English-educated public servants' ¹⁹³ was of slow growth and the third annual report mentions the enrolment of six members only for the year 1900. The general meetings were thinly attended ¹⁹⁴ and during these eight years the average attendance marked less than fifteen, and we can hardly believe in its influence on Buddhism.

Valisinha Edward De Silva ¹⁹⁵ of Mahahunupitiya

192. The Buddhist, Vol.vii, No.10, (22.3.1895), p.75.

193. The Buddhist, Vol.xi, No.8, (May 1901) edited by C.Jinarajadasa, Y.M.B.A, Colombo, p. 127.

194. In 1899 only 12 members, in 1900, 14 members, in 1901, 10 members, and in 1904, 15 members.

195. Some believe that David De Silva Gunasekara was the name.

entered the 'order of celibacy' under the instructions of Dharmapala, changing his name into 'Brahmacāri Valisinha Hariscandra', and founded the Anuradhapura Mahabodhi Society on 7. January 1900.¹⁹⁶ The Anagarika's success in gaining possession of the sacred sites in India encouraged his one and only 'faithful pupil' to continue his Master's policy at Anuradhapura. The archaeological discoveries of sacred sites there and the religious policy of the administrators in allowing the Christians to erect their churches, convents, toddy taverns and meat markets in Anuradhapura¹⁹⁷ further encouraged him to form the Society. Its aims were the establishment of a seat of learning at the Mahāsīmā, the encouragement of preachers and the distribution of Buddhist pamphlets. Hariscandra was an itinerant preacher but his diaries and the published volumes submit us only little evidence with regard to his services.¹⁹⁸

196. Mahābōdhi Saṅgarāva, edited by V. Hariscandra, (October 1903), editorial.

197. A Roman Catholic church, a Convent and the residence of the priests, were built near Abhayagiriya and Maha Bodhi, and a church for the Church of England at Mirisavāṭiya. Also five taverns and a meat market near Mihintalā Dāgāba. Sarasavi Saṅdarāsa, 6.3.1901, and 29.8.1905. Mahābōdhi Saṅgarāva, (June 1903), editorial.

198. I am grateful to Mullapitiye Rālahāmy who owns the diaries and notes of Valisinha for all this information.

Hariscandra raised claims ¹⁹⁹ of the Buddhists to the sites in 1902 and he 'continued to press on his fellow religionists their obligation ... to continue their efforts for the recovery of the land on which Anuradhapura stands'.²⁰⁰ In December he started his 'Mahabodhi Journal' in Sinhalese and continued it for three years. When religious riots broke out at Anuradhapura on 9 June 1903 he was charged with the 'creation or augmentation' of the riots.

These sacred sites at Anuradhapura turned into a stage where the new Buddhist leaders could exhibit their leadership. Some leading officials of the Y.M.B.A formed themselves into a special committee and submitted a report on the lands at Anuradhapura to the inaugural meeting of the Buddhist National Congress (Buddha Mahajana Sangamaya or Samitiya) held at Ananda College on 10 April 1903. Not only its birth but its structure also sounds different from other societies. Any village where a Buddhist school or a Buddhist association was available, could be represented in the Congress, under the leadership of the headman (vidāna āraci) in that village.

The Buddhist National Congress was an inane

199. Diaries of Valisinha, 10.9.1902 and 5.5.1905.

200. C.O. 54- 683. Despatch No. 307 sent by West Ridgeway to J. Chamberlain on 22.7.1903.

imitation of the Indian National Congress.²⁰¹ The utterances of the organ of the Theosophists indicated that this venture was not a result of heartfelt devotional feelings but of sheer personal rivalry for leadership with Anagarika Dharmapala. At one stage the editor of Sarasavi Saṇḍarāsa raised doubts on the genuine need for a Congress in Ceylon.²⁰² When 'Anagārika Arbūdaya' ²⁰³ anonymously appeared in 1905, it did not create the expected barrier to the popularity and leadership of Dharmapala, but in order to compete with the new Buddhist ²⁰⁴ leaders Dharmapala with the assistance of Piyadasa Sirisena, the editor of the first Sinhalese national newspaper and 'Sinhala Jātiya' /the inconsistent pupil of Dharmapala, published 'Sinhala Bauddhayā' and entered the 'path of struggle' for leadership.

The policy of Olcott in regard to the community of bhikkhus was unvaryingly followed by his disciple Dharmapala. At the formation of the M.B.S Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala was

201. The leaders deceitfully declared their dissociation from politics, at the first Congress. Buddhist, Vol. xii, No. 6, (March 1903), p. 122.

202. Sarasavi Saṇḍarāsa, 7.4.1903.

203. D.B. Jayatilaka is suspected of writing this book. Hemapala Munidasa, Rasāvadānaya, (1956), pp. 151-154.

204. Vāranīyagoḍa Gamagē Pedrick Silva of Iṇḍuruva, who changed his name in 1895, following Dharmapala's advise. (Lakminipahana libel case report, in Dinamina, 14.10.1914.) He edited Dharmapala's newspaper, but left him under an alleged theft of paper for printing his novel.

elected president, but the work was carried out under the guidance of Olcott. It is interesting to note that not a single meeting or public address was presided over by Sumangala nāyaka thera. He was only a nominal president of the Society.

Following the Master's procedure Dharmapala had utilised the monks in obtaining a certificate but excluded them from activities of the M.B.S. Like Olcott Dharmapala also believed in the superiority and piety of the monks of the Rāmañña sect and kept four of them at Buddhagaya in July 1891. When he edited the 'Maha-Bodhi Journal' he cited as its motto the advice of Lord Buddha to the priests.²⁰⁵

During his tours ^{the} in collection of money he excessively criticised the monks of Ceylon. His contumelious abuses were continued even after the creation of his 'order'. The impious bhikkhus were addressed as 'samana yakkhas' and 'samana petas'. Their 'indolence and ignorance, pleasure lovingness, sleeping and eating' ²⁰⁶ were subjected to his criticisms. He absolutely debased the position of the monks in Ceylon, and he was considered

205. 'Go Ye, bhikkhus, and wander forth for the gain of the many, for the welfare of the many, in compassion for the world, for the good, for the gain, for the welfare of the gods and men, Proclaim, O bhikkhus, the Doctrine glorious, preach Ye a life of holiness, perfect and pure' (Mahā Vagga, Vinaya Piṭaka).

206. Return to Righteousness, edited by Ananda Guruge, p. 520. Maha Bodhi Journal, edited by D. Hevavitarana, Vol. xxiv, No. 8, p. 237.

as a 'messenger of death' to the Sangha.²⁰⁷

In October 1895, he entered the 'Anagārika Brahmachāri' order, changing his peculiar white dress into yellow. This action was a severe blow to the community of bhikkhus and could be considered as highly destructive to them. Before considering the effect of this unique innovation we must discuss the evolution of this 'order' since it has not yet been the subject of discussion by scholars.

"In my ninth year I was initiated in the Brahmachariya vow by my father at the Temple, and on that day he advised me that a Brahmachari should be contented (sic) with what is given to eat, and that he is expected to sleep little. The vow was taken only for 24 hours; but in my case it had made a permanent impression on my tender mind."²⁰⁸

As Dharmapala wrote this in 1933, it indicates his adamant adherence to a misguided concept of his childhood. In the practical Buddhism prevailing in Ceylon today one can hardly find such a vow as described by Dharmapala. What he describes in this sentence is nothing but the taking of the Eight Precepts and the advice normally received by any child on that day. The child has to be calm and patient and is not allowed to eat after midday. He has to spend the day listening to Bana or in meditation. These curious activities will definitely impress the sensitive mind of a child. But unfortunately Dharmapala

207. 'nitara neka sangun haṭṭa bāna vadina lesa
 patara e Vasavat maru evveku vilasa'
 Lakaṅgana Hasuna, (March 1912).

208. 'Reminiscences of My Early Life', in Return to Righteousness, edited by Ananda Guruge, (1965), p.698.

has misunderstood the whole procedure of 'taking aṭasil' as a vow of Brahmachariya, which is only part of it. When there are seven other Precepts what caused the emphasis on this one Precept? For a boy of nine years this Precept has no relevance. One may wonder whether the complexity of sounds in the Pali words of this Precept puzzled his mind and created a special interest. A child who usually recites the Five Precepts encounters this mysterious term for the first time in the Third of the Eight Precepts.²⁰⁹ Did this originate the misunderstanding?

The idea of 'Brahmacāri' developed further when he read the story of Isisinga an ascetic, in Milinda Praśnaya which he read in front of his mother after returning from school. It was a fascinating story²¹⁰ for a child, relating the mental power of an ascetic who frightened the king of gods (Śakra) as a result of his dissociation from women. The feeling of power was introduced into the child's mind and he determined to become 'Brahmacāri'. When he was seventeen his two

209. Instead of 'Kāmesu miccācārā veramanī sikkhāpadam samādiyāmi' (I undertake the precept to abstain from wrong conduct in sexual desires) in the Five Precepts, 'Abrahmacariyā veramanī sikkhāpadam samādiyāmi' is to be recited when taking the Eight or Ten Precepts.

210. Two other versions of the same story come in Nalinikā Jātaka and Alambusā Jātaka in the Jataka Book.

year old sister died and he saw the depressed state of the mother and finally decided 'not to become an avenue for sorrow to a woman' that is to say never to marry. By the time he started living at the Buddhist Press he had become conscious of his physical defect ²¹¹ and his immature biological knowledge had created a dreadful fear in him towards sexual life; he explained to his father his unwillingness to beget children who will be physically handicapped like himself. He traced the origin and the development of his concept of 'Anagārika Brahmācāri' in a letter written to his father.²¹² In that letter he insisted on the selfishness of monks. He entered the 'Brahmacāri' order in 1886 and subsequently entered the 'Anagārika' order in 1895. He organised the order and prepared a code of rules for Brahmācaris in 1914.²¹³ But his order was not a successful one and it was confined to only three disciples.²¹⁴ After

211. He was lame and limped while walking.

212. The letter written by H.D. David on 24.1.1886. For this letter and all the personal information on Dharmapala, I am grateful to Mr. David Karunaratna, one time editor of Sinhala Baudhayā.

213. Maha-Bodhi Journal, Vol. xxii, No. 10, (October 1914), pp. 237-239. Wickramasuriya entered the order of celibacy under a ritual performed by Dharmapala on 15.2.1914, at the opening of Mallikā Baudha Santāgāra Sālāva. Maha-Bodhi Journal, Vol. xxii, No. 2, p. 51.

214. Brahmācari Valisinha Hariscandra, Brahmācari D.E. Wickramasuriya and Brahmācari Devapriya Valisinha.

forty five years of 'Anagārika Brahmācāri' life he entered the community of the Sangha as a bhikkhu on 13.July 1931 as Siri Devamitta, Dhammapala bhikkhu received the higher ordination on 16.1.1933. He could not observe a 'vas' as he died on 29.April 1933.

The significance of the term 'Anagārika' in a Buddhist context should be discussed here, in order to realise its influence on the status of the monks in Ceylon. In the Pali Canon these terms 'Anagārika' and 'Brahmācāri' are employed to describe a higher level of practice; they are always connected with the Order of the Sangha who renounced the world,²¹⁵ but not with lay devotees like Dharmapala.

'Brahmācāri Paṭiñño'²¹⁶ (who promised to be a celibate) is used in connection with bhikkhus by Lord Buddha. Many times it was stressed by Him that the Brahmācāri vow could only be observed after renouncing the world.²¹⁷ A person who

215. 'agārasmā anagāriyam pabbajati.agārasmā anagāriyam pabbajito'.Dīgha Nikāya,Sīlakkhandha Vagga,Brahmajāla Sutta,(Cultural Department Edition),(1959),p.32.

216.Anguttara Nikāya,Catukka Nipāta,Āpatti Bhaya Vagga, p.462.

217. Majjhima Nikāya, Mahā Yamaka Vagga,Mahā Saccaka Sutta, p.566; Samyutta Nikāya,Kassapa Samyutta,p.332; Vinaya Piṭakaya, Pārājikā Pāli,p.28.
'sambādho gharāvāso rājapatho,abbhokāso pabbajjā. naidam sukaram.agārasmā ajjhāvasatā ekanta parisuddham samkhalikhitam brahmācariyam caritum,yannunāham kesamassu ohāretvā kāsāyāni vatthāni acchādetvā agārasmā anagāriyam pabbjeyyam'.

enters the order is recognised as a Brahmācāri.²¹⁸ But until 1931, Dharmapala was only an upāsaka (devotee) in the Buddhist church. If these doctrinal aspects are to be considered, the assumption of the title Anagārika²¹⁹ by Dharmapala shows a mythical misconception which aggravated the debasement of the Sangha community in Ceylon.

Sinhalese Buddhists who were ready to accept everything new tendered a warm welcome to their popular hero when he assumed the new status. His robe-like cloth and yellow dress misled the people easily and his criticisms on the bhikkhus elevated his position over the existing order, so that he was venerated more *p* respectfully than the monks. For lectures, he was taken in processions under canopies and over carpets. Buddhists employed reverential phrases in describing him as they do for bhikkhus.²²⁰ His Anagārika status was

218. Anguttara Nikaya, Tika Nipata, p. 376.

219. The interpretation of Anagārika as 'homeless' naturally misled many scholars. He left his father's mansion in 1886, but he owned 'Valavva' in Aloe Avenue in Ceylon and bought No. 41, Gloucester Road, and No. 89, Ealing Place in London.

220. He was travelling in 'Sōbana Māligāva'. I will reproduce here the description as told by David Karunaratna. 'Dharmapala hāmuduruvō dēsanāvata vaḍina davasē apē gedara dan valandala...' (On the day priest Dharmapala delivered the lecture he had meals at my place). Specially note here the honorific terms which I have underlined, here used to describe an 'upāsaka' and not a bhikkhu.

unchallengeable by the priests and his attacks were powerfully responded to by the ordinary and wealthy Buddhists alike. He summarised the state of the bhikkhus thus:

"Most of the bhikkhus are indolent, they have lost the spirit of heroism and altruism of their ancient examples He thinks he has done his duty if he goes to the funerals and once a week gives a discourse on the ethical aspects of the Buddhist religion." 221

Though the audience did not realize it, as far as we are concerned, we are in a position to judge that this attitude was the outcome of the activities of the Theosophists and their ardent followers.

Valisinha Hariscandra once criticised the 'love for life' of the monks who did not accompany Dharmapala to India, for fear of death at sea.²²² The leaders of the Y.M.B.A and the Buddhist National Congress adhered to the same policy on the Sangha. The former was an inactive organisation in this period while D.B.Jayatilaka was the president of both societies. From its very birth, however, the Buddhist National Congress brought about destructive effects by the attitude it showed to bhikkhus. The Congress not only advocated the management of Buddhist Temporalities by establishing special societies under the Congress but they felt in^a great need of an authoritative power to control the sangha and appealed to the

221. 'Our Twenty Years' Work', reproduced in the Return to Righteousness, edited by Ananda Guruge, (1965), p.748.

222. Sarasavi Saṅdarāsa, 28.8.1900.

government to hand over this authority to the Congress.²²³

Though the priests of the country had been excluded from these societies for almost twenty years, they nevertheless became deeply conscious of the gravity of the situation and acted accordingly. On 29.12.1904, the High priests and anunāyakas of Malvatta and Asgiriya, and the chief incumbents of Dambulla temple, Mahiyangana temple, and Adam's Peak ' after performing religious rites praying for the health of the invalid king' described in a petition ' the painful experience' which they had undergone for the last fourteen years, since the introduction of the Buddhist Temporalities Ordinance in 1889. Without hesitation the petitioners stated that 'the worst enemy of Buddhism could not have invented a machinery better calculated to disorganise and utterly overthrow Buddhism in Ceylon than the Ordinance No.3 of 1889 and its successive amendments'.²²⁴ These loyal bhikkhus realised the vulnerable feature of the Congress and appealed to His Majesty that 'all interference of native headmen who are in government employment, with the civil or religious rights of the priesthood or management of temples or Buddhist Temporalities may be absolutely forbidden'.

223. The Buddhist, Vol. xii, No. 7, (April 1903), p. 148.

224. C.O. 54-683, Vol. iii, Despatch No. 394 sent to J. Chamberlain by the Governor on 7.9.1903.

The village headmen who formed the chief representative in the Congress were frightened on hearing the news of the petition and promptly discontinued their participation in 'disloyal activities'. This caused the death of the Congress. The dying Congress at its fifth and the last meeting decided on two futile resolutions, which showed its true colour; one sought the power to control the Sangha and the second attacked their enemy-leader Dharmapala.²²⁵

The activities of the B.T.S, M.B.S, Y.M.B.A and B.N.C during this quarter of a century (1881-1906) and their attitude towards the community of bhikkhus accomplished their intention of minimising the status of the Sangha in the field of religion and of securing the leadership for the wealthy English educated class of laymen in religious affairs. The place occupied by the priests prior to 1880 underwent a decisive change and they were absolutely forced to sever their associations with social activities, except in the few external observances in alms and funerals which without their participation could not be fulfilled. At the dawn of the new century we are able to witness the results of the activities of these lay leaders and how their

225. Sarasavi Saṅḍarāsa, 2.4.1907.

leadership was making attempts to advise the monks on their duties in the field of Buddhism. We read of a campaign led by these new advisers in reminding and advising the monks of their duties. The monks were reluctant to participate in the new ventures launched by these new lay leaders in the name of Buddhism, but they were directed to advise the ordinary Buddhists against 'visiting Theatres,²²⁶ harassing and torturing animals,²²⁷ consuming liquor,²²⁸ smoking cigarettes,²²⁹ and on Sunday schools.²³⁰ These facts reveal the establishment of the new lay leadership over the community of bhikkhus in the religious field.

226.Sarasavi Saṅḍarāsa,13.3.1903.

227.Sarasavi Saṅḍarāsa,3.3.1903.

228.Sarasavi Saṅḍarāsa, 17.1.1902; 21.1.1902; 28.1.1902; 31.1.1902.

229.Sinhala Bauddhayā,30.6.1906.

230.Sarasavi Saṅḍarāsa,19.1.1906.

Chapter three

RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES IN RELATION

TO THE LITERARY REVIVAL

The development of Sinhalese poetic literature is our main concern in the succeeding chapters, in the light of the religious activities of the country. It appears to be impossible to discuss the poetry of the period without tracing the relevant religious affairs which influenced its evolvment and without which the poetry and the affiliated literary revival might not have taken place. In the preceding chapters we have not mentioned these activities, which arose out of Buddhism and which were accountable for the birth of a new poetic literature which became equipped with modern techniques and facilities in the second half of the nineteenth century.

The old Sinhalese literary tradition was carried on by some scholars in Southern and Sabaragamuva areas without any sort of reaction towards the modern avenues employed by the Christian missionaries in the educational and evangelical fields. But the religious affairs which we are to discuss here in brief (though they invite a serious and a lengthy analysis) now altered the traditional orientation of literature and compelled most traditional

scholars to employ new methods, in defence of Buddhism from the criticisms of the Christians.

Our main thesis in this chapter is that the development which we are witnessing now in the field of Sinhalese poetry which occurred during the second part of the nineteenth century arose solely as a reaction to the efforts made by the Christian missionaries to disseminate Christianity. If a religious ardour of this quality had not been evinced in Ceylon, we might not be in a position to discuss what we now call literature in Sinhalese. The modern facilities of printed books, circulation and distribution among readers, selling books at a price, and reading printed books of one's own were interesting new additions to the field of Sinhalese literature. The Buddhists, as a method of safeguarding Buddhism from the unbearable criticisms of the Christians ^{were} determined to utilise these modern methods to the full. ~~and~~ subsequently, when ~~the~~ religious enthusiasm languished or was completely lost, these new facilities, which were essential features to the growth of literature, were maintained by a handful of Buddhists, though they had known them only for a short time, by converting their interests into literary creations.

With the prime intention of converting the Buddhists from their 'idolatry and heathenism' the Baptist Mission

(1812), the Wesleyan Mission (1814), the American Mission (1816) and the Church Mission (1818) arrived in Ceylon,¹ during the early period of British administration. In order to secure a clear knowledge of the existing religious beliefs among the Buddhists enquiries had been made by the Christian missionaries who were in the Island prior to the arrival of British, even in 1770,² through friendly correspondence with the Buddhist priests. The Christian missionaries succeeded in adapting themselves to the local scene, studying the native languages and preaching in those languages. At earlier stages the Netherlands East India Company neglected the teaching of reading and writing to the natives, but with the passage of time they realised the necessity of such education. The Government of Java offered to procure a printing press with Sinhalese type and in 1736 it was reported to be in 'active operation' under the Dutch government.³ The printing press was employed by these Protestants to popularise their religion among the natives. The Protestants were slow in production

1. T.A.Mendis, *Lankāvē Katōlika Śāsanayē Itihāsayā*, (1886), p.32
C.N.V.Fernando, "Christian Missionary Enterprise in the Early British Period", *University of Ceylon Review*, Vol. viii, No.2 (April 1950), p.110 and No.3 (July 1950), p.203.

2. OR 6603 (65), a palm leaf manuscript written on 21.1.1770 by the chief priest of Mulgiri Vihara, as a reply to various simple queries made by a Christian minister, is preserved in the British Museum. 'The Buddha Gaudma's Doctrine' which appears in *The Mahavansi*, *The Raja Ratnacara*, and the *Rajavali*, edited by Edward Upham, Vol.iii (1833), pp.109-166, though it contains some similar questions is different from this.

3. J.Murdoch and J.Nicholson, *The Classified Catalogue of Printed Books and Tracts in Singhalese*, (1868), (Madras), pp. 2-3.

of religious literature and the press seemed to be inactive for some time and 'no attempts to circulate the Scriptures are recorded from 1789 until 1812'. The Colombo Auxiliary Bible Society was instituted in 1812 for the circulation of Scriptures.⁴ The Wesleyan Mission started its printing press in 1815 at Colombo and in 1816 the press and the types of the Bible Society were amalgamated with it. 'The Wesleyan Mission Press rendered a very essential service by providing improved founts of Sinhalese type of various sizes'. The Colombo Auxiliary Religious Tract Society was founded in 1825, under the secretaryship of Rev. J. Chater and issued religious tracts against Buddhism, but these were of 'little value' as the writers had imperfectly understood the system.⁵ Another press was started by the Ceylon mission of the Church Missionary Society in 1822 at Kōtṭe. At Kandy the Baptist Mission started a printing press and maintained it for six years; then it changed its title to Sinhalese Tract Society and was incorporated with the Ceylon Branch of the Christian Vernacular Education Society in 1859. The Roman Catholic Press was commenced on 23.10.1843.⁶ Thus these established religious

4. J. Murdoch and J. Nicholson, *op.cit*, p. 3.

5. *Ibid*, p. 9.

6. T. A. Mendis, *op.cit*, p. 33.

societies and these printing presses printed and distributed a considerable amount of religious literature among the Buddhists of the Island. While the Colonial government was making indecisive attempts to decide on the religious policy to which she should adhere even in the second half of the nineteenth century, the priests of the Christian Missions successfully engaged in educational and evangelical duties with incomparable zeal and untiring devotion, with the help of these printing presses.⁷

The Colombo Auxiliary Bible Society issued 19,000 Bible copies, 35,500 New Testaments and 59,500 Scripture portions up till 1865.⁸ The Baptist Mission printed and circulated 140,100 tracts and books in Sinhalese in the six years of its existence from 1841.⁹ The Sinhalese Tract Society printed and distributed 1,532,038 tracts, handbills, pamphlets and periodicals up to 1859.¹⁰ According to the report of the Wesleyan Mission Press issued for the two decades starting from 1844, the press printed and distributed 109,170 books¹¹ and in the fifty years of its existence

7. Ministers like Harvard, Callaway, Squance, Hardy and Gogerly were skilled printers. History of the Methodist Church in Ceylon (1814-1964), edited by W.J.J. Small, (1972), p.84.

8. J. Murdoch and J. Nicholson, op.cit, p.5.

9. Ibid, p.15.

10. Ibid, p.18.

11. The report of the Wesleyan Mission Press sent to London by Rev. James Nicholson on 1.3.1864.
MMS, Box viii (1858-1867), file (1863-1867).

up to 1865 it circulated one and ^ahalf million books in the Island, among the Sinhalese Buddhists and professed Christians. With these publications the Sinhalese Buddhists witnessed how the advanced new facilities could be employed in the name of religion. This heavy influx of Christian literature impressed the minds of the people in different ways. Some deserted their hereditary religion, became critical of Buddhism, and were interested in Christianity. Meanwhile the bilingual intelligentsia after witnessing the impact on the Buddhists predicted in 1852 that 'we hope the day may yet come when the Trio of the One Great God, will become a substitute for the Triad of Buddhism; and when men shall in truth and in spirit worship Jehovah, and, in a strain like the following sing praises to His name',¹² and composed poems as models for future poets.

Though their false expectations and dreams did not come true, the reality of the situation is worth discussing and is interesting too. This was the first time in the history of the Island that literature, by which was always meant religious literature, had become so widespread and circulated among ordinary Sinhalese Buddhists. Prior to this period, books almost always belonged to monks and such books, which were written on palm leaves, were kept

12. James D'Alwis, *The Sidat Saṅgarāva*, (1852), pp. 133-134.

in a special room called the 'pot gula'(library) in the temples. The medicated palm leaves were strung together between two thin planks coloured with paints; these hard covers are called 'kamba'. Books were copied by specially trained clerks or priests with a pen called 'panhiñda'. These books are described by Buddhists as 'great books'(pot vahansē). On the Vesak Full moon day these books underwent a procedure of 'polishing in black' (kalu mādīma) by the laity who hoped to become scholars in the next birth, under the guidance of the bhikkhu who was in charge of the library. Before Christian missionaries, who actively distributed their religious books among the ordinary people without charge in most cases, a book was a luxury to the laity in Ceylon.

The Sinhalese Buddhists did not react to this influx of religious literature at the beginning. The two successful printing presses existing during the period we discuss, which both belonged to the Christians, one to the Wesleyan Mission and the other to the Roman Catholics, continued their work without hindrance from the Buddhist laity and clergy. While the local elite engaged in incredible predictions about Buddhism in Ceylon the foreign priests, native ministers, catechists and preachers not only distributed religious books printed on these presses but

held public sermons and delivered lectures against Buddhism at 'road junctions and market places' at which the primitive beliefs of the Buddhists were criticised. The Buddhist revival witnessed in the second half of the nineteenth century was initiated and originated by these activities of the Christian missionaries, and it directly gave rise to the literary awakening when that religious interest had subsided.

Apart from these religious tracts and books the Christian missionaries introduced to the Sinhalese Buddhists two other new literary avenues which they were unaccustomed to. Those were periodicals and newspapers. The first periodical issued in Sinhalese seems to have been the 'Monthly Reward' (Māsika Tāgga), which consisted chiefly of Scripture stories, in 1832.¹³ 'The Treasure of Ceylon' (Lankā Nidhānaya) started in 1839 was discontinued in 1846 but in 1850 the second series was started by the Sinhalese Tract Society.¹⁴ The editor of this magazine was Rev.R.S.Hardy. 'The Touchstone' was commenced by Rev.J.Harris of the Kandy Baptist Mission in January 1842¹⁵ and 'The Commentator' by Rev.C.C.Dawson of the same mission was started in 1844. 'The Touchstone' and

13.J.Murdoch and J.Nicholson, op.cit, p.46.

14.The oldest existing copy of a periodical in Sinhalese is the issue for February 1850.It is preserved in Śrī Pragnāsēkhara Library, Navagamuva, Ceylon.

15.This must be a different 'Uragala' from the Roman Catholic one.

'The Sower' (Uragala saha Vapurannā) of the Roman Catholics were printed in 1849,¹⁶ and another magazine 'The Colombo Catholic Magazine' in March 1846. 'The Treasure of Science' (Śāstra Nidhānaya) by John Pereira of the Native Normal Institute was printed in 1846 and 1847. 'The Lankābhivṛddhiya', another Catholic periodical, was printed in Kandy in March 1852. The Church Mission printed 'The Sinhalese Church Missionary Record' in July 1852. All these periodicals, though their life span was very short, appeared for the propagation of Christianity.

The introduction of the newspaper into Sinhalese literature can undoubtedly be attributed to Christians. 'The Classified Catalogue of Printed Books and Tracts in Singhalese' mentions 'Lankālōkaya' commenced at Galle in June 1860 by W.A.Eaton as the first Sinhalese newspaper.¹⁷ But Catholic sources furnish us with a newspaper of the Catholic Church in the year 1846, namely 'Saddharma Sangrahaya'.¹⁸

These widely circulated tracts, books, pamphlets, periodicals and newspapers of the Christian Church were an impetus to the Buddhists. The revival of the Buddhist interest in their own religion can be entirely and directly

16. T.A. Mendis, op.cit, p.34.

17. J. Murdoch and J. Nicholson, op.cit, p.48.

18. Idem, p.34.

assigned to the reaction shown to the compositions of Rev. D.J.Gogerly, the chairman of the Southern Circuit of the Wesleyan Mission in Ceylon. He was not convinced by the exaggerated statements of local admirers but faced the situation in reality and wrote that 'others have stated that Buddhism is in a state of decadence and ready to perish ... but it is still in lively existence and more energy has been manifested by the priests'.¹⁹ 'The Evidences of Christianity' (Kristiāni Pragnāpti), his scholarly criticism on Buddhism, ran to a second edition in 1861, in the Sinhalese language. This time the edition was limited to five thousand copies in Sinhalese and a thousand copies in English and was distributed among the Buddhists.²⁰ This composition created a long lasting impression in the religious and literary fields in the nineteenth century.

'Kristiāni Pragnāpti' is a book in three parts. The first part consists of a criticism on the 'false state' of Buddhism and the second part seeks to prove

19. Letter of D.J.Gogerly to Hoole, on 4.6.1862, MMS, Box viii (1858-1867), file(1858-1863).

20. Ibid.

But Rev.J.Scott who published the book in 1915, in his introduction gives different dates of its editions. He says that parts one and two were printed in 1848 and a second edition of those two parts in 1853 and a third in 1857. The first part in English and the full book in Sinhalese in 1862 ran to a second edition in 1865.

Pragnāptiya Hevat Bauddha Dharma Vibhāgaya, (1915), introduction.

the truth of Christianity while the third deals with the elementary principles of Christianity. The impact of this book on Sinhalese society was said to be so great that the author claimed that a 'large number of people were led by the treatise to give up their faith in Buddhism, and became earnest enquirers into the truth of Christianity'. It was clear that this conversion was an eye-opener to the high priests of the Buddhist Church who were struggling with doubts regarding the purity of the consecrated boundaries in those days. They realised the position and forgetting all their ideological differences organised themselves into a strong opposition to react against these publications.

Rev. Baṃbarāṇḍē Revata, a bhikkhu of Gotāṭuvē Vihāra, Baddegama,²¹ in September 1861 received Gogerly's book from Rev. Gunasēkara of Baddegama Mission and after reading the book he sent a long review of the book to his friend Rev. Gunasēkara on the 9 th of October 1861.²² Baddegama was a stronghold of Christian missionaries from 1819 and the first Anglican Church for Ceylonese congregational worship was also built at

21. This temple is now known as 'Śrī Pāda Goḍālla'.

22. The late Telikaḍa Upasena nāyaka thera, (19.5.1972) and Vāliviṭiyē Śirīnivāsa thera of Śrī Pāda Goḍālla, helped me to read this document, which is still lying at the temple.

Baddegama.²³ The exchange of critical books between Buddhists and Christians displays the enthusiasm of both parties. This long, hand-written document was devoted only to criticising the first three pages of the 'Pragñāpti' and cites many examples to show the ignorance of Gogerly of the Pali language in which the Buddhist scriptures were written. 'The seditious nature of the book is manifest when the author of Pragñāpti has deliberately omitted some portions of Dhammacakkappa-vattana Sutta, the First Discourse of Buddha, to substantiate his mythical views on Buddhism'.

By that time Gogerly was recognised by the English educated academic circles of the Island as a veteran Pali scholar and there were some translations of Buddhist Suttas into English to his credit published in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.²⁴ In his treatise the author quotes the First Discourse of the Lord Buddha

23. C.N.V. Fernando, University of Ceylon Review, Vol. viii, No. 3, (July 1950), p. 204.

24. He read papers on Buddhism at the Royal Asiatic Society and these lectures were reproduced in their journal.
 The paper read on 1.5.1845 appeared in Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 7-29.
 The paper read on 1.11.1845 appeared in Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 93-117.
 The paper read on 4.2.1846 appeared in Vol. 1 No. 2, (1847) pp. 14-62.
 The paper read on 17.8.1846 appeared in Vol. 1 No. 2, (1847), pp. 84-90.
 Colombo Observer on 15.4.1861 issued a supplement to his lecture on Buddhism which he delivered at Y.M.C.A. He contributed a series of articles on Buddhism to 'The Friend'.

thus; 'me bhikkhave ananussutesu dhammesu cakkhum udapādi, vijjā udapādi, āloko udapādi'. Rev. Revata in his friendly letter communicated to Rev. Gunasēkara alleged that by starting the Pali sentence with the word 'me' at the beginning Gogerly showed his ignorance of the Pali language, since he extracts only part of the word 'ime' neglecting the simple grammatical rule of sandhi in that language. Rev. Revata also raised objections on the omissions of some words, which were true as one can see by comparing the text of the Sutta with the book of Gogerly. ²⁵

Concluding his thirty page critique on the first three pages ²⁶ of 'Kristiāni Pragñapti', Revata therā lamented the inability of the Buddhists to reply to these polemic concoctions ²⁷ as no printing press was available to the

25. The above cited quotation runs as follows in the text: 'idam dukkham ariyasaccantime bhikkhave pubbe ananussutesu dhammesu cakkhum udapādi, gñānam udapādi, paññā udapādi, vijjā udapādi, āloko udapādi'. Maha Pirit Pota, edited by W. Pemananda, (1957), pp. 150-151.

26. Rev. Revata wrote that he would have to compile a bigger book than Gogerly's if he wanted to criticise it all and it would take months. 'eka boru potak nisāt epamana kal vehesa darannaṭa apaṭa tamunnānsē niyama karanavā sudusu noveyi'.

27. Revata therā cited examples of books written by Christians where Buddhism appears in a humiliating and ridiculous light, such as 'Banamaḍu Yanavā', 'Lamātānī Hāminē Punci Rālahāmy yana Tundenāgē Sākaccāva', and 'Nirvāna Bēdaya', which we are unable to find now.

Sinhalese Buddhists to express their views in print.²⁸

The traditional scholars then only realised the inadequacy of the available resources in the presence of the advanced modern facilities of the literary world. When the Christians were in a position to produce religious books in lakhs in a short time how could the Buddhists cope with them by hand-written ola leaves?

When these personal critical notes, which were not intended to be kept for a long time, were being exchanged between the Buddhist and Christian priests at Baddegama, some other Buddhist priests of the Island simultaneously realised the dangerous position which they had to encounter in the future and became involved in organising a front to meet the challenge of the Christians. Not only Baddegama, but Galle and Koṭahēna too prepared the ground to meet Gogerly's composition with all their might. The nāyaka thera of the Siamese sect in Colombo instructed Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala thera of Bōgahagoḍālla, Galle, one of the promising scholars of the day, to compose a reply to 'Kristiāni Pragñapti'. Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala too admitted that nearly seven thousand copies of the 'Pragñapti' had been printed and many who read the book had already deserted Buddhism and embraced Christianity.

28. Buddhāgamē ayaṭa accu kantōru nāti nisā mīṭa prati-viruddhava ovunṭa kumak kala hākida?

While engaged with his reply Sumangala met with a serious problem to be answered, that is, the accounts of the Sakvala according to Buddhist sources. To reply to this problem he sought the assistance of Āmbagahavattē Saranankara who was observing 'Nisa' at that time in Burma, and invited him to contact the scholars in Burma on that point.²⁹ Gogerly's unanswerable question rests on the description of the Universe.

"Again if the Buddhist accounts of the Sakvala and the motions of the sun in Sakvala be true, the length of the day must be nearly the same throughout the whole year"

"When it is twenty minutes past five o'clock in Colombo it is midnight in London".³⁰

Rev. Gogerly in his criticisms of the descriptions of the Universe, stated that in London the sun is visible sixteen and half hours in the month of June and on the contrary in the month of December the daytime is limited to seven hours and forty minutes. When the knowledge of the Universe was so meagre it was not amazing that even the most intelligent scholar of that time was in a

29. Letter to A. Saranankara by Hikkaduvē Sumangala, on 15.10.1861, reproduced in Y. Paññānanda, *Śrī Sumangala Caritaya*, (1947), Vol. ii, p. 685.

30. D. J. Gogerly, *Kristiāni Pragñaptiya*, (1915), pp. 33-34.

quandery and could not believe in the visibility of the sun for more than twelve hours. He confessed his inability to disprove Gogerly since there were 'merchants' coming from the West to Ceylon and even the Christian Church was making arrangements to take interested Buddhists on a pilgrimage with the intention of converting them after showing them the miraculous motions of the sun. Sumangala was expecting a clue from Burma to solve this problem. Even if it was solved at the hands of Burmese scholars — subsequently there still arose the acute difficulty of printing the reply to 'Kristiāni Pragñapti' since all the available presses were under the control of the Christians.

Migeṭṭuvattē Gunānanda of Pahala Pansala, Koṭahēna, started a series of fresh lectures against Christianity every Sunday at the temple premises from March 1862. He advised the audience on the approaching danger to Buddhism and with Kornēlis De Silva Ponnampēruma Appuhāmy as the secretary founded a society in defence of Buddhism from the Christians. 'The Society for Propagation of Buddhism' (Sarvagña Śāsanābhivṛddhi Dāyaka Dhamma Samāgama) under the guidance of Mohoṭṭivattē

31. Rev. J. Nicholson's letter to Dr. Hoole, on 15.3.1862, MMS. Box viii, (1858-1867), file 1858-1863.

Gunānanda, to create an impression in the hearts of the ordinary Buddhists organised Buddhist religious processions and held religious festivals in the temple on Poya days. 'The streets were paraded daily for about a week by a large procession, in the centre of which was an elephant carrying a Pagoda containing an image of Buddha', ³² reported the priests of the Wesleyan Mission in Colombo to the secretaries of the Mission in London.

Migeṭṭuvattē Gunānanda discussed the necessity of a printing press with the other eminent priests of that time and collectively signed an appeal to the Buddhists. After describing in highly sentimental terms the former prosperous state of Buddhism the signatories stressed the urgency of the printing press to the Buddhists to reply to this polemic literature distributed among the Buddhists by the Christians.

"Several of us have conferred on the subject, and it appears that no less than four hundred pounds are necessary to meet the expenses ... Seeing the injury inflicted on the religion of the Great Omniscient one and hearing these scurrilous terms used, it would be improper for us to be wanting in zeal. Taking therefore the present downfall of religion into consideration

32. Rev. J. Nicholson's letter to Dr. Hoole, op.cit.

and regarding the personal and public benefit to be derived from the sacrifice of wealth in order to remove this injury, let all the faithful inhabitants of the Island contribute according to their ability, towards raising the above mentioned sum".³³

The priests of the Wesleyan Mission realised that a new spirit was being brought about by the extensive circulation of their chairman's treatise and described the new awakening to the General Secretaries of the Wesleyan Mission in London.

" For half a century Buddhism has given but a silent resistance to the missionary and the Gospel; but now we find a vigorous and influential movement among the adherents of that false religion"

"In Colombo and along the coast the people are all enquiring. At Wattalpola ... our native minister had to meet a hundred anxious questioners in one day".³⁴

So far the preparations of Buddhists to organise a printing press and the activities of missionaries to propagate Christianity by printing abusive and critical books had gone ^{on} smoothly. But in the month of June in the year 1862 events changed suddenly and the peaceful actions were replaced by aggression on the part of the Buddhists. The residence of the chairman ^{at the time?} at Kollupitiya and its premises became an easy prey at the hands of angry Buddhists.

33. A translation of the circular accompanied the letter of J. Nicholson on 15.5.1862, to Dr. Hoole.
MMS.Box viii(1858-1867), file (1858-1863).

34. Ibid.

"Buddhism which some thought to be nearly dead, is making violent efforts to obtain the ascendancy. They have in Colombo a weekly lecture in fierce opposition to Christianity, and published tracts ³⁵ of a more virulent nature and in addition placard the walls at Colpetty, if not in other places, with written papers stating with other abusive matters, that they have now learned that it will be preferable to worship the crows that fly through the air or the dogs that run barking through the streets than to worship Jehovah and Jesus Christ" ³⁶

While the organisers of the Society for the Propagation of Buddhism were planning to have the printing press at Koṭṭahēna, Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala was searching for a way to print his reply in Galle. He was having discussions with other eminent priests at Galle who had signed the circular issued by Gunānanda's Society and who also felt the dire necessity to have a printing press for the Buddhists. They were very prompt at organisation and in the month of July at Galle, the first Sinhalese Buddhist press was started.

The Lankōpakāra Press issued a report in September 1865 which traces its own origin and development.³⁷ 'The polemic writings of the Christians against Buddhism and the Buddhists have converted many native adherents of

35. Though Rev. J. Nicholson also mentioned these tracts, they can not be printed materials. They may be some hand-written palm leaves.

36. Rev. D. J. Gogerly's letter on 17.6.1862.

37. This report is now in the possession of Kalukoṇḍayāvē nāyaka thera, Principal, Vidyodaya Pirivena, Colombo.

Buddhism to Christianity. Many of these conversions have been done by the printing press. If this scheme is to be continued the Buddhist Church will definitely perish and the Buddhists are faced with the terrible need of a printing press. It needs a capital of a thousand pounds. Bulatgama Siri Sumanatissa nāyaka thera of Paramānanda temple, Minuvangoḍa, Galle, stressed the necessity to all Buddhists and attempts were made to collect money. A share was worth ten pounds and many lay devotees promised to buy shares.

When the time came for the collection of the promised subscription it seems that most of the devotees had completely forgotten their promise. Two did not contribute a single penny and some others donated seven or eight pounds^{each} but not ten according to their pledge. Only fifteen kept their promise and the total collection was one hundred and eightyone pounds. But though they did not receive one fifth of the expected capital the organisers started activities to establish the press. They bought a second hand machine from England.

At the time of the establishment of the Lankōpakāra Press at Galle the Christians became aware of the silent revival among the Buddhists. The sudden uprising of these Buddhist priests gave an impetus to the ordinary Buddhists to realise the position around them and those

who read the tracts and pamphlets sometimes either patiently admired the statements or vehemently criticised these proclamations against Buddhism. Thus 'the controversy is the general subject of conversation in the streets and market places of Colombo, and I believe that the excitement extends along the coast as far as Matura'.³⁸ All the priests of the Wesleyan Mission accepted that this 'new awakening among the heathens was due to our venerable chairman's work on the Evidences of Christianity' but took no action. Rev. Gogerly remonstrated over the silence of his colleagues. 'I am sorry to state that the great importance of this Buddhistical movement does not appear to excite any active opposition on the part of Christian ministers in general'.³⁹ and again he informed the authorities in London that 'the Buddhists are now exceedingly active, and our men are either old or sick'.⁴⁰

Before Sarvaṅga Śāsanābhivṛddhidāyaka Dhamma Samāgama was equipped with a printing press, Mohoṭṭivattē Gunānanda insisted on printing a reply to 'Kristiāni

38. Letter of D.J.Gogerly on 17.6.1862 to Dr.Hoole.

39. Ibid.

40. Letter of D.J.Gogerly on 30.1.1861.

Pragñapti' somehow and printed it on two different presses without allowing either press to realise what they were publishing. Thus in August 1862 the 'humiliated Buddhists' of Ceylon were fortunate enough to read a printed pamphlet of two pages with a critical note on Christianity. 'Durlabdhī Vinōdanī'⁴¹ published on 23.8.1862 appears to be an answer to 'Kristiāni Pragñapti' and 'Bauddha Labdhi Parīkṣāva' of the Christians and the author in one of the volumes abused the Bible, with the following verse:

'tada gaṇḍa vāhena geri kuna pirivara gatta
vāda vāda budina vilasin kānahil rotta
maṇḍa maṇḍa nuvanavat nāti dana pili gatta
pada bāṇḍa tibena boruvaki Baibala potta'.⁴²

(Like jackals eating a nauseating smelly carcass of a cow, senseless people have accepted the false compilation called the Bible.)

Though the Buddhists rejoiced at their first venture in printing a reply to the Christians secretly in two — Christian printing presses, their cunning efforts to print a Buddhist pamphlet when all the existing presses were at the hands of the Christians were quickly discovered by the Christians. 'Sudharma Prakaranaya',⁴³

41. The only available copies of this tract (six volumes) in Ceylon are found at Śrī Pragñāśekhara Library.

42. M. Gunānanda, Durlabdhī Vinōdanī, Vol. 6, p. 8.

43. Three copies of this tract are available at Śrī Pragñāśekhara Library.

a twenty page tract, appeared not only in reply to the 'Durlabdhī Vinōdanī' but also in denigration of the attempts of the Buddhists, and at its beginning the editor ridiculed the efforts of Mohoṭṭivattē and his colleagues and accused them of inability to print the materials in one press.

This unsympathetic review inclines the reader to decide that Mohoṭṭivattē and his supporters were not in a position to avail themselves of a printer who would duly do the printing for the Society, so that the organisers had to compose the material of the pamphlet at one place in Compañña Vīdiya, where nobody at the press would get the chance to read the contents (as the compositors merely gather separate letters ^{into} ~~the~~ words and are not interested in the sense), and printed the composed material at a press in Vālikāḍa, where the printers would not read what they are printing. This procedure clearly shows the indefatigable courage and shrewdness of the Buddhist priest leaders of the time and the problems they had to encounter in the protection of their religion at this time.

Arrangements for the Lankōpakāra Press at Galle started in July 1862, and the first Buddhist tract printed in a Sinhalese Buddhist printing press was published in the month of October 1862. 'Sudarśanaya', a composition

of Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala thera, appeared thus as a reply to the 'Sudharma Prakaranaya', 'Bauddha Labdhi Parīkṣāva', 'Satyārtha Prakāśaya', 'Bauddha Vākya Khaṇḍanaya', 'Kristiāni Pragñapti' and 'Satya Dhvajaya' and it was circulated throughout the Island. In the editorial of the first issue mention was made of the criticisms on Lord Buddha and Buddhism and the editor commented that these abusive statements had reached an unbearable point and it was the duty of the Buddhists to be alert to the situation.⁴⁴

Although the first efforts at printing a pamphlet had become a laughing stock of the Christians who owned the printing presses, the Society for the Propagation of Buddhism which had established another printing press at Koṭahēna pursued its vigorous campaign against Christians by printing 'Kristiāni Vāda *
Mardanaya' in November 1862.⁴⁵ This press also adopted the name of the Society. The author of this journal described his attempts not only as a reply to Gogerly but as a composition which would extol Buddhism as truth and Christianity as false by refuting the statements of Gogerly.⁴⁶

44. The report of the Lankōpakāra Press, (1865).

45. This is available at Śrī Pragñāśēkhara Library.

46. M. Gunānanda, Kristiāni Vāda Mardanaya Nohot Kristiāni Pragñaptiyata Uttara, No. 1, pp. 1-2.

The first issue of 'Kristiāni Vāda Mardanaya', an eighteen-page volume, ends with three verses and this composition plainly shows us that the Buddhists had deliberately commenced serious operations against the Christian writings by that time.

"avidu misadiṭṭu paviṭṭu anuvana lavana liya pav paṇḍuruvan
 paniṇḍu visakaṭṭu vilasa sagamok magaturaṭṭa tada kuriruvan
 mebaṇḍu adamiṭṭu pelak ekatuva boruya kiyamin tunuruvan
 pasiṇḍu kara āta tanā potpat munindu basa kara nisaruvan
 "ruvanagaya mila nodat anuvana velaṇḍadana lobayen mahat
 pemina ganimina kadāmāṭi rāvaṭṭunā men anuvana ayat
 amana guna nāti kuḍiṭṭu paviṭṭō kiyana borubas nāti arut
 rāgena sābayayi sitā gena budusasuna hara nirayē vāṭet
 "sitaṭṭa kayaṭṭada sāpata dena neka sasara duk biya haravanā
 sataṭṭa gālavena pinisa muni desu daham tērum noma genā
 kaṭṭaṭṭa ā pamanakin sihisan nātiva pal boru doḍavanā
 ayaṭṭa min matu sihi lābennaṭṭa karunu pavasami sākevinā⁴⁷"

(Some ignorant, false-viewed sinners who help to grow groves of sin on the way to heaven, like the venomous teeth of a cobra, have composed and circulated books which criticise and falsify the Lord Buddha, His teachings and His disciples.

(Once some inexperienced merchants in greed for wealth without realising the greater value of gold bought worthless glass clay(kadāmāṭi) and were deceived.

47. Kristiāni Vāda Mardanaya, (1862), Koṭahēna, Vol. 1, p. 18.

Likewise now the uncritical people who have deserted the Buddhistic Church believing in the absurd fallacies of unscrupulous Christian sinners will suffer in hell. (The doctrine of Buddha consoles the mind and the body. It removes sufferings in the cycle of birth and saves human beings. Those who do not realise these elements and engage in talking stupid nonsense, we will in brief inform of the necessary facts to regain their lost senses.)

By the end of the year 1862, these two printing presses and their publications bore ample evidence of a revival in Buddhism. The Buddhist priests who had heard of the official dissociation of the British government from Buddhist religion determined to become the protectors of their own religion. This awareness gave them a spirit to organise activities against the Christians, though it was not longlived. We come across only two issues of Kristiāni Vāda Mardanaya and twelve issues of Sudarśanaya, and after that the enthusiasm of the Buddhists seems to have gradually sagged.

Most of the literature written by the admirers of both religious groups could not be considered as serious ^{or} ^{Academic} and scholastical work on the respective religions but were merely pamphlets produced under fanatical feeling. The illogical and irrational accounts of the writers were unable to provide either the Buddhists or the

Christians a strong intellectual foundation on which they could stand.

Mohottivattē Gunānanda in the sixth volume of 'Durlabdhī Vinōdanī' to prove the truth in Buddhism compared it with Eastern medicine (āyurvēda) and astrology (nakṣatra) promulgated by ancient sages, which he believed to be true.⁴⁸ Meanwhile through their ignorance of linguistics the Christian writers made a large number of ridiculous statements which one might incline to think jokes. 'Sudharma Prakaranaya' sought to show the inferiority of Lord Buddha by considering the honorific terms employed in Sinhalese to describe Him. 'The Buddha is called Pasās (who has five eyes) and the Sinhalese word for Devil is pīsa! The author takes the terms 'pasās' and 'pīsa', two entirely different terms, as synonyms, considering the mere similarity of sounds, and says that the Master of Buddhists is the Devil.⁴⁹

Superficial analysis of this calibre did not provide any group with a firm base for the new religious struggle. After the circulation of 'Sudarśanaya' in the Island some who were delighted at reading the printed Buddhist pamphlet made generous contributions to the advancement

48.M.Gunānanda, Durlabdhī Vinōdanī, Vol.6, (January 1863).

49.Sudharma Prakaranaya, quoted in K.Pragnāsēkhara, Sinhala Puvatpat Itihāsa, Vol.1(1965), pp.118-119.

of the press. Uḍuhāvara Abhayakōṇ Jayasundara Herat Bandāra, Mudliar of Ūva province, collected money for the Fund in the Up-country which provided the press with some new furniture for the office and allowed it to continue its printing for some time without any disturbance. 50

The insufficiency of income created problems for the organisers of 'Lankōpakāra Press' at Galle. The undaunted high priest, Bulatgama Dhammālankāra Siri Sumanatissa nāyaka thera, wrote to his personal friend Vara Paramendra Mahāmakuta Sammatadeva Vamsavamsatīvara, the king of Siam, confessing the sorrowful position of Sinhalese Buddhists amidst the activities of the Christians and appealed for a considerable contribution to continue the meritorious work of printing Buddhist literature. The king after reading his friend's letter became the highest donor to the Fund by contributing two hundred and twelve pounds and fifty pence, which surpassed all the contributions received from the Sinhalese Buddhists of the Island from its inception.

Enthusiasm and religious devotion were not consistent features among the Buddhists of that time. Besides the continuation of 'Sudarśanaya' and 'Durlabdhī Vinōdanī',⁵¹

50. The Report of The Lankōpakāra Press, (1865).

51. The last volume of Durlabdhī Vinōdanī appeared in February 1863.

at Galle and Koṭahēna respectively, 'Samyag Darśanaya'⁵² of Mohoṭṭivattē and 'Satyārtha Pradīpikā' of Baṭuvantuḍāvē Pandit appeared in the field of Buddhist writings in 1863. But there were effects of a more active nature among the Christians. 'Bauddha Vākya Khandanaya', 'Satya Dhvajaya'⁵³ and 'Bāla Pradīpaya',⁵⁴ as magazines and 'Arunōdaya' and 'Lakrivikirana' as newspapers appeared in the field of Christian writings.

The activities of the year 1863 incline us to consider that the new methods employed in the recent past in printing religious literature by the Buddhists and the Christians were put aside for a time to allow the oral debating system to enter the field. 'The controversy with the Buddhists still continues' reported

52. The first copy of this magazine is in Śrī Praṇāsēkhara library. There is another 'Samyag Darśanaya' attributed to the same year reprinted in 1883 but the contents of that magazine are quite different from the old one; it started with this verse:

'aga mula māda nāta kaya nāta ruva nāta atapaya kisi nāta
deyyannē
sāduna kenek nāta siṭi idamak nāta sāma tāna pirilā vāḍa
innē
siyaluma bala āta guna kelavara nāta lōkaya māv eka
deyyannē
mehema kenek ātnam lova satṭen daruvan āta vaṇḍa
gāhānun nē'

At the end of this pamphlet there is a statement about its origin. 'varṣa 1863 āgamvādaya paṭan gat laṅga -di bauddhayek visin accu gasvā prasiddha kārana lada mema poṭa....'.

53. M. Gunānanda, Samyag Darśanaya, Vol. 1, p. 1.

54. The Wesleyan Mission Press report says that it printed 2500 copies of Lamayinṭa Pahana and 1000 copies of Satya Dhvajaya monthly.

Rev.J.Scott of the Wesleyan Mission to the general secretaries of the Mission in London.Excitement was prevailing in and around the city of Galle, and in the month of March 1863, 'the priests in the neighbourhood challenged the Christians, to prove that one of Mr. Gogerly's arguments in the Pragnāpti against the Omniscience of Buddha was well founded... Mr.David De Silva, who came from Colombo on purpose, ably defended Mr.Gogerly's rendering. After his first address however the priests, though polite to us personally, could not allow any further freedom of speech, interrupted any statement which made against their views, and finally demanded that we should say nothing more than yes or no to their questions. There was a large concourse of people present and about a hundred yellow robed priests, several of whom were men eminent for their learning. After the controversy so unfairly conducted was at an end, reports were industriously spread that the Christians were vanquished and several printed statements full of misrepresentations and abuse were put forth from the Buddhists' printing office in the compound of which the discussion had taken place'. 55

The presence of the Christian priests at the premises of the Buddhist printing press displays their bravery in

55. Letter No.680 sent on 18.8.1863 by Rev.J.Scott to London,MMS,Box viii(1858-1867,file(1863-1867)).

the propagation of their religion. The circulation of a printed pamphlet by the Buddhist monks against the Christians shows us that they believed in the victory of Buddhism even before the controversy took place.

Another important and interesting meeting was held at Galle Face on Saturday 25 th July 1863. For a short time, it appears to us that both the religious parties converted their energy into oral debates, which were more powerful than the printed books. 'Rev. George Baugh of the Wesleyan Mission has convened the meeting in consequence of a challenge given to the Buddhists to come forward and substantiate - if they could - charges made by them against the late Mr. Gogerly with respect to his work on Buddhism, The Christian Evidences. Several missionaries of the Church Missionary Society were present as well as nine or ten of our own Society. A considerable number of natives, Roman Catholics as well as Protestants, with a few Buddhists attended ... Mr. Hardy called upon a native gentleman to preside ... and Mr. D... who was with Mr. Gogerly so many years being our ... Pali scholar was called upon to state why this meeting had been summoned. Having responded to this call he said that the Buddhists had laid very serious charges against the author of Pragnāpti which were utterly without foundation and false. He first read from their own tracts... their

accusations and then showed to the assembly, by quotations from Pali books- the Buddhist Scriptures - that they were false. He occupied about two hours in proving the correctness of Mr. Gogerly's translations which he did in a most able and conclusive manner. At the close of his energetic exposition of the craft of the priests, he called upon the Buddhists present to mark the conduct of these priests and Pandits who must be either very ignorant or very dishonest'.⁵⁶

Meanwhile following the footsteps of their rivals in religious matters Sinhalese Buddhists introduced newspapers in Sinhalese to the field of religious literature. Under the patronage of Gunatilaka Atapattu Mudliar of Salpiṭi Kōralē, Jayasūriya Āraccige Hendrick Perera of Ātunbāṇḍi Vatta, Colombo, published the first issue of 'Lakminipahana' (The gemmed lamp of Ceylon) on eleventh September 1862.⁵⁷ The editor of the fortnightly was Don Johanna Panditatilaka Koggala Gurunnānsē and it was printed on a printing press of their own. This newspaper at a later stage was accepted and recognised as a Buddhist paper.⁵⁸ At its inception the Christians

56. Letter of G. Baugh to Dr. E. Hoole, on 31.7.1863.

57. The first issue of the paper is not available in the National Archives in Ceylon, though it is the first registered Sinhalese newspaper in the country. But Kalukoṇḍayāvē nāyaka thera possesses an original copy.

58. Lakminipahana, 3.12.1887.

realised the danger of a possible Buddhist newspaper and decided to counteract it.⁵⁹ But though it was later attacked and claimed to be a Buddhist newspaper we are unable to establish this fact from contemporary sources. The first editorial mentions nothing of Buddhism or religious activities; but it promises to develop the knowledge of the ignorant Sinhalese villagers. In 1867 Mohoṭṭivattē Gunānanda expressed his view of the paper as 'religiously impartial'.⁶⁰ These statements would hardly allow us to consider any association of the paper with Buddhism and the way it was run in the first two years proves that its main intention was not religion but knowledge for the villagers. But since the editor was an ex-monk and the patron and the organisers were Buddhists, the Christians may have thought that it was directed against Christianity, and the susceptible Christians in the following year started a newspaper in Sinhalese in opposition to Lakminipahana. Vaidaman Perera and Company of Colombo announced in Lakminipahana the birth of 'Lakrivikirana' (The rays of the sun of Lanka).⁶¹ Though the two names

59. J. Murdoch and J. Nicholson, op.cit, p.48.

60. M. Gunānanda, Satya Mārgaya, (1867), editorial.

61. Lakminipahana, 4.7.1863,

The National Archives of Ceylon has not got the first issue of Lakrivikirana but it is available at Śrī Praṅṅāsēkhara Library, Navagamuva, Ceylon.

sound as if there was some sort of enmity between 'Lakminipahana' and 'Lakrivikirana', Lakminipahana once congratulated the editor of Lakrivikirana for rendering a great service and mentioned his 'impartiality'.⁶² There was no ill feeling between the two papers at the beginning, but 'Lakrivikirana' in later years printed some controversial articles criticising Buddhism.⁶³ Don Kornēlis Vīrakkody was its first editor.

Roman Catholics started their first weekly newspaper 'Arunōdaya' on 1.8.1863. After announcing its appearance the editor of 'Lakminipahana' warned the Buddhist public to realise the devotion of Roman Catholics to their religion. 'The Roman Catholics are so pious and dedicated to their faith, I believe, that they will subscribe for the paper even if they can not read'.⁶⁴ Any accepted truth is liable to prove false in Ceylon, and the fear brought by 'Arunōdaya' disappeared in six months. 'Lankānganāva' announced the sorrowful death of 'Arunōdaya' in 'Lakminipahana'.⁶⁵ The Christians were split into many rival groups, each acting to gain their own superiority among the Sinhalese. 'Lakrivikirana'

62. Lakminipahana, 25.5.1864.

63. Lakrivikirana, 4.10.1873; 15.11.1873.

A controversy was carried on by Don Karolis Appuhāmy of the Buddhist side and Don Bonopāsisi Pradinandu of the Christian party.

64. Lakminipahana, 25.7.1863.

65. Lakminipahana, 25.5.1864.

criticised 'Arunōdaya' of the Roman Catholics⁶⁶ and 'Subhāran̄ci Horanāva' of the Dutch Reformed Church.⁶⁷ Even the by then accepted Buddhist paper was partial and sometimes supported one group or the other. In an article entitled 'Pahana Kirana saha Arunet Varuna' A.M.D., the writer, while praising the services of 'Lakminipahana' and 'Lakrivikirana' criticised the Roman Catholics and the Reformed Church.⁶⁸

While the newspapers of the Buddhists and the Christians were competing with each other in religious propaganda, Mohoṭṭivattē Gunānanda allegorised the position in the following manner: 'The Christians have waged a furious war against the Buddhists. These innocent Buddhists are like blind men who can not perceive the Truth since they have lost their mind's eye during the battle'.⁶⁹

In the month of December 1863, a most significant event occurred in regard to the new literary revival connected with the religious struggle. Lankābhinava Viśr̥ta Press, another Buddhist printing press, commenced in this month. Its origin too could be attributed

66.Lakrivikirana, 26.3.1864.

67.Lakrivikirana, 15.9.1865.

68.Lakminipahana, 2.11.1864,

This statement is reproduced in K.Pragñāsēkhara's Sinhala Puvatpat Saṅgarā Itihāsayā, Vol.1, (1965), p.180.

69.M.Gunānanda, Samyag Darśanaya, Vol.1, p.1.

indirectly to 'kristiāni Pragñapti' of Gogerly. Andiris De silva Śrī Devarakṣita Baṭuvantuḍāvē Pandit, the most eminent lay scholar of that time, was a teacher at the Native Normal Institute, where his help was sought in reading proofs of 'Kristiāni Pragñapti' by its author and the chairman of the Wesleyan Mission under which the school was governed. Realising the implications of assisting to print a criticism on Buddhism, Baṭuvantuḍāvē declined to support the preparation of the book and consequently received dismissal from teaching.

—The well known scholar was not however a religious fanatic and determined to devote his leisure partly to literature and partly to Buddhism. He realised the advantages in having a printing press of his own not only for the propagation of religion but also for the dissemination of knowledge which was scarce.

Though there were three new printing presses in Colombo, namely Sarvagnāśāsanābhivṛddhidāyaka press, Lakminipahana press and Lakrivikirana press, Baṭuvantuḍāvē faced many barriers in establishing his press in the city. With the assistance of a Sinhalese carpenter he prepared the necessary characters in wood.⁷⁰ 'Don

70. I am grateful to Kalukoṇḍayāvē nāyaka thera for this information. Before starting the work of the press there is a belief that Baṭuvantuḍāvē composed 'Pragñapti Khandanaya' which we are no longer able to find.

Phillip De Silva Āpā Appuhāmy, Vettisinha Kornēlis Appuhāmy and seven or eight respectable devotees' contributed money for the purpose and in December 1863, Lankābhinava Viśrta Press issued its first publication called 'Satyārtha Pradīpikā'.

'Satyārtha Pradīpikā' of Baṭuvantuḍāvē was the first notable contribution that appeared in Sinhalese to combine literary interest with religious spirit. The author says thus in his introduction; 'This compilation will be of ample help to those who study the poetic literature, astrology and traditional medicine and will provide a clear view of Buddhism to those who criticise it through ignorance'. All the ten volumes of this magazine followed the same system and every issue consisted of four articles. The first article was devoted to Buddhism and was rather long when compared with the other articles. The second article was on astrology and was a paraphrase on some Sanskrit stanzas of 'Daivagñā Kāma Dhēnu'. Sanskrit stanzas of 'Caraka Samhitā' of Suśrta were produced with a Sinhalese paraphrase in the third article on medicine. The last article was a commentarial study of verses of Guttila Kāvya, a Sinhalese poem of the fifteenth century. This system was followed in all the volumes and the editor described one hundred and sixty nine verses of Guttila Kāvya.

Baṭuvantudāvē thus could be counted as the pioneer of the new literary publications in Sinhalese literature though he did not devote the full volume to literature. His article on Buddhism was lengthy and it is evident that nobody during that period could avoid the religious problem. Thus at the dawn of the year 1864, we witness scholars making attempts to revive literature along with the new religious feelings. An initiative in printing some literary works followed the publication of 'Satyārtha Pradīpikā'. Lakminipahana press and Lakrivikirana press printed some works connected with literature. These were limited only to poetical works. In 1864, Lakminipahana press printed 'Nandiya Velaṇḍa Katāva',⁷¹ Lakrivikirana press printed 'Bhavōpakāra Taraṅga Mālaya saha Mugaṭi Katāva',⁷² 'Jana Vamsaya',⁷³ and 'Anāgata Kīmvalin',⁷⁴ and Lankābhinava Viśṛta press printed 'Prātihārya Śatakaya',⁷⁵ under the name of Āpā Appuhāmy. Sarvagnā Śāsanābhivṛddhidāyaka press too followed the practice of printing literary compilations apart from their main

71. J. Murdoch and J. Nicholson, op.cit, p. 54. But a printed copy of this work is unknown in Ceylon.

72. Ibid, p. 53. These copies are no longer available to the reader. Mugaṭi Katāva, a tale which describes a mother who killed a mongoose thinking her son had been killed by it when she saw the blood which actually came from a cobra it had killed to save the son, is a small work of eleven verses and it was reprinted in 1914.

73. Ibid, p. 57. This is still available.

74. Ibid, p. 55. Can not be found now.

75. Ibid, p. 54. This is available now to the reader.

religious purpose in 1865. Each and every printing press in Colombo realised the importance of printing these literary works as a means of income to support the activities of the presses. Otherwise no printing press could last for any time. They understood the risk which they would be undergoing in confining their presses to religious affairs and in the meantime used the machines for printing other work which would gather some money to pursue religious activities. Thus we can note the birth of the new literary tradition joining hands with the religious revival.

The year 1864 passed with less writings in the religious sphere. The Wesleyan Mission issued 'Weslian Pravṛtti',⁷⁶ and the Reformed Church printed 'Subhārañci Hornāva'.⁷⁷ Lakminipahana stressed the service rendered by the Wesleyan Mission to the development of the Sinhalese nation while attacking the Reformed Church and its publication. The Buddhists printed 'Labdhi Tulāva', a monthly journal, in October 1864, and 'Sumati Sangrahaya' of Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala thera. Only three volumes of each magazine were printed and no more.⁷⁸ The first volume

76. Lakminipahana, 5.10.1864, reviews the third volume.

77. Lakminipahana, 5.10.1864, has received the first volume.

78. All these copies are available to the reader at Śrī Pragnāsēkhara Library, Navagamuva, Ceylon.

of 'Sumati Sangrahaya', an eleven page magazine, ends with a verse composition sent by a friend.

"metun lova tatu hāṇḍina pāvasū munitumā desu daham vilasina
taman pera kala kusal akusal belen suva duk viṇḍit sāmadena
eyin samaharu danin vāḍiveti diliṇḍu veti hāmakala bohōdena
nāṇin samaharu vāḍeti samaharu dadadanō veti melō hāmatāna.

"nuvana maṇḍa dana kelesa vāyam kalat nāṇavat noveti suvipula
meyina nohāṅgeda danan pera kala lesin melovama labana kampa-

-la

nodāna tatu lesa nimala dahamak liyū Baibala kabala aḍubala
dudana pera kam palak satahaṭa nātāyi kivu nunuvanin dāḍi-

- kala.

"kisit pera kala danan kala kam nātōt samaharu goluma kara-

-mina

tavat samaharu bihiri aṇḍa kora dadun karamin melova

mavamina

pasat iṇḍuran nomaṇḍa karamin nuvana suvipula vana bohōdena
mahat bala dī kumaṭa deviṇḍek māvṇāda mē anaḍu melesina."⁷⁹

(According to the doctrine of Lord Buddha, who understood the three worlds, human beings due to the meritorious and demeritorious activities which they have committed in their last births rejoice or suffer in this world. Some become richer and some poorer, some are intelligent when others are stupid in this birth.

(Foolish men though they try hard can not be intellectuals and this proves that what they secure in this world is a

79. H. Sumangala, Sumati Sangrahaya, Vol. 1, pp. 10-11.
(mitrayek visin liyā evana laḍi).

result of what they committed in their last birth. Without realising this pure law the Bible, the stupid compilation of the Christians, denies the influence of the acts of the last life on this life.

(If the committed act does not bear fruit in this birth how do some become deaf, dumb, blind and crippled while others are complete with their five senses and why did God created the world in this manner? Is not it a great injustice?)

'Lakminipahana', the accepted 'Buddhist' newspaper, was not printed for three months for pecuniary reasons. But the organisers 'resurrected' it on 25.5.1864. The editorial writtⁿ on that day clearly shows the sufferings that the editor and his supporters had in continuing the newspaper. The editor lamented over the jealousy of others who made attempts to ruin the paper. Even this 'new' Lakminipahana could not survive for long and Kornēlis Perera Amarasinha Appuhāmy, a new publisher, started it for the third time on 16.8.1865.

In 1865, not a single written work appeared in the field of religious struggle. The energetic protagonists of both groups preferred to have oral debates rather than written literature. They might have thought that the spoken word would have a more influential impact on listeners than the printed word. The printed book is of no value if the receiver does not read it. Since most of the religious literature was circulated free of charge

the receivers of the literature could not be counted as actual inquirers. During a debate a more lively spirit prevailed. The speakers of both groups were present, and sat on the stage face to face in front of their respective admirers. A galaxy of judges would give the verdict. It was a moment of disagreeable tension, but a source of mental emancipation for those who were confused after reading the printed religious literature which could not help them intellectually to select the religion which they should follow. The literature always supplied the reader with only one version, while in a debate the listener is fairly treated, since both the involved parties secure the chance to defend and criticise their respective theories.

An oral controversy of this nature was arranged in a school at Ganēgama, Baddegama, on 8.2.1865. Bulatgama, Kahatoṭa, Kahavē, Hikkaḍuvē, Vāligama, Potuvila and Mohoṭṭivattē priests represented Buddhism, while Rev. Parsons, Rev. Silva and Rev. Baugh defended Christianity.⁸⁰ But unfortunately the debate was forced to a sudden end by the Mudliar of Gaṅgaboḍa Pattuva, who was afraid of religious disturbances at Baddegama. The two European judges present there at the invitation of the Mudliar could not understand a single word of Migeṭṭuvattē Gunānanda, the speaker of the Buddhist side, but after

80. B. Siri Sumanatissa, Baddegama Vādaya, Part 1, (1865).

witnessing the angry gestures and emotional nuances of the orator ordered the leaders of both religions to continue the debate, not in public, but in writing if they wished to do so. The enthusiastic audience lost their chance of hearing the leaders. It seems that the orators were reluctant to continue the debate in personal correspondence which would not call for public participation. Though the debate was abruptly ended Mohoṭṭivattē Gunānanda, the selected speaker on Buddhism, was unanimously agreed to be the leading oratoricāl defender of Buddhism.

The year 1865 was significant in the history of religious and literary ventures of the country. The strong emotions evinced by the Buddhists at the Baddegama controversy appear to have acted as an effective setback to the activities of the Christians against Buddhism, since we barely come across any more Christian religious writing until 1873. Meanwhile the Buddhists, seeing this inactivity of the Christians, engaged in a struggle to gain profit for the money they had invested in the establishment of the first Sinhalese Buddhist printing press in Galle.

During the first two years after its inception,

Lankōpakāra press was able to print 39,665 books in defence of Buddhism. In August 1864, the founder subscribers of the press met and discussed the present and future of the press. The meeting did not reach a smooth end. The subscribers were expecting something ^{in return} for the money which they had contributed at the beginning. The books were printed and were distributed at a price, but they had received nothing. They had apparently forgotten the national and religious sentiments which had motivated them in 1862. The subscribers unanimously resolved that they should discontinue their financial connections with the press in order to make it a 'public' institution and take back what they had contributed at the start. They further suggested that if anybody wished to donate some money for the Fund he could do so. But when the time came for donations one member took away his full amount without leaving a single penny as a donation, one left seventeen pounds and another left five pounds, while others left only two pounds each. As soon as the contributors took away their money in this manner the press became faced with a serious problem and could not survive. The press thus became a 'poḍu' (public) institution but without a future. Even then Bulatgama nāyaka thera, with the assistance of Vāligama Sumangala thera, and Doḍandūvē Piyyaratana thera, wished to

continue the press.⁸¹

While the first printing press of the Buddhists was dying, the edition of the Three Piṭakas at Purāṇa Vihāra, Pālmaḍulla, a remarkable event which created an interest in traditional scholarship in the field of religious work, was started in 1865, and thereafter the scholar monks who took part in the scheme prepared a compendium of rules and regulations for future use in connection with the edited works in 1874. All the bhikkhus who were acclaimed for their traditional scholarship were invited and engaged in editing with a great enthusiasm forgetting all the petty differences prevailing among them in regard to various external religious practices. The only recognised bhikkhu who was excluded from this literary project was Mohoṭṭivattē Gunānanda. Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala thera, the other composer of religious books, led the monks of the Siamese sect in the editing work at Pālmaḍulla. But the irrepressible vigour of Migeṭṭuvattē Gunānanda could not be silenced by any forces, under these circumstances. He devoted his time and energy to the usual procedure of lecturing, writing and printing books which criticised Christianity. After the controversy at Baddegama, all that we find in the field of religious

81. The report of the Lankōpakāra press, (1865).

I believe that this report, which is now in the Śrī Pragnāsēkhara library, was the last publication printed in the press. After thirteen years in 1878, it was resurrected by S.A.Z. Sirivardhana, to print newspapers and other literary works.

struggle by way of writings, publications and oral debates of the Buddhists against the Christians, were the sole outcome of the untiring efforts of this single bhikkhu.

There appeared no single Buddhist religious book or magazine or tract in 1866. On 7.2.1866 at Udanviṭṭa Vihāra, in Hatara Kōralē, a controversy took place between Mohoṭṭivattē Gunānanda and John Edwards Hunupola, a famous ex-priest of the Buddhist church. The proceedings of the debate were interpreted by both parties to their own triumph and partial reports were printed. As a reply to Hunupola's 'About Udanviṭṭa Controversy' Mohoṭṭivattē Gunānanda employing the same title printed a book which ended with a verse which ridiculed the conversion of Hunupola Nilame, using a folk parable.

"hiṅgā ka kā un sāṭiyē	hiṅgā	nokā
vikārayen vāhuniya muge āṅgē		yakā
ekā kī basaṭa rās vī degoda		rākā
Sakā kivat nēviya gaṅga dāmū		hakā". ⁸²

A free rendering will be as follows:

(Abandoning his normal life as a Buddhist priest he became a Christian, like a man out of his senses. Believing others' utterances once a foolish man put his conch into a river thinking that it might come out of the water, but lost it. Hunupola's fate is no different from his.)

82.M.Gunānanda, Udanviṭṭa Vāda Katāva Gānaya, (1867), p.11.

The self-judged imaginary victory obtained in the oral debates turned both parties into inert admirers of their own success for a long time. After a lengthy lull, in a school hall at Gampola, on ninth and tenth of June 1871 Mohoṭṭivattē Gunānanda met Sirimanne, a catechist, Hunupola Nilamē and Samuel Perera in a debate. During this period from 1864 upto 1872 when all his interested colleagues were engaged in literary pursuits, in Pālmaḍulla at the beginning and in their temples in the later years, Mohoṭṭivattē Gunānanda was the solitary⁸³ Buddhist leader who organised and printed 'Satya Mārgaya',⁸⁴ a newspaper and 'Saddharma Sangrahaya', a magazine for the propagation of Buddhism. But by that time even the uncontrollable Buddhist leader too was adopting a sober tone in his religious works. Referring to those documents, Rev.R.S.Hardy mentions that 'there is a great difference in the spirit that is now manifested by the Buddhist writers. At first their blasphemies were ribald and revolting; and scurrility was the staple of their productions. But in their later works they have kept within bounds of decency to a greater extent, though still by no means courteous in their manner or refined in their words'.⁸⁵

83.The first copy of the newspaper is unavailable, but in Pragnāsēkhara Library there are 116 issues of this paper.

84.Not even a single copy is available in Ceylon. Reference to this paper is made in Lakminipahana on 17.4.1867.

85.This statement is reproduced in J.Murdoch and J.Nicholson, op.cit, p.53.

Another important reason for the relaxation of the Buddhists was the uprising hostility between various sections of Christianity.⁸⁶ Roman Catholics became a target of attacks from the Reformed Church. This enmity was aggravated by the support of the Buddhists for the Reformed Church. The appearance of 'Satya Viniscaya', a newspaper of the Reformed Church, is described thus in Lakminipahana.

"The General of the Reformed Church army will visit every home in Ceylon on the tenth of next month to define the proper position of the miserable unscrupulous Catholics".⁸⁷

Certain ministers who became dissatisfied with the 'inadequate salary and the status' of the Wesleyan Mission joined the Church of England at this time.⁸⁸ The European ministers of the Wesleyan Mission being now the minority among the ministers were afraid of their future and were reluctant to accept their native ministers as their 'brothers'.⁸⁹ These diversions among the Christians hardly gave them time to write in defence of their religion and

86. Jācobait Vēda Bhēdaya, (1889).

This hostility reached an ungovernable state in 1874 and 1875. Letter of J.A. Sparr to G.S. Perks on 19.3.1874, MMS, Box (1868-1876), file 1868-1874. Letter of G. Baugh to Perks, on 30.3.1875 and 21.6.1875.

87. Lakminipahana, 17.6.1867.

88. Rev. R.S. Hardy's letter on 16.11.1864.

89. This indifference was continued for many years and was aggravated by the starting of a Tamil Mission in Ceylon. The confidential correspondence of Rev. J.O. Rhodes and S.R. Wilkin exhibits the prevailing position, and it culminated in a petition submitted by the 25 native ministers to London, on 22.11.1880.

this silence influenced the Buddhists who would not engage in the 'religious war' unless the Christians printed a piece of religious literature against them.

These criticisms to which the Roman Catholics were subjected gave them the spirit to unite and to produce literature to safeguard their position and they were able to inaugurate a newspaper with the highest capital ever raised for such a purpose in Ceylon. Juan Fernando of Mālukanda, Colombo, with the intention of supporting the Orphanages for children, printed 'Gñānārtha Pradīpaya Hevat Anat Daru Ayādīma' on a printing press which belonged to the Catholic Orphanage on 7.6.1866.⁹⁰ The inconsistency in the attitude of 'Lakminipahana' which attacked the Roman Catholics in introducing 'Satya Viniścaya' the paper of the Reformed Church, was clearly demonstrated when the editor of same 'Lakminipahana' wrote a favourable review on 'Gñānārtha Pradīpaya',⁹¹ which was edited by the same offended Roman Catholics.

Under the instructions of Migeṭṭuvattē Gunānanda, D.P.Vijayasinha of Kegalle, the founder of 'Saddharma Samāgama', now printed a series of critical notes on the Bible called 'Vibhajja Vādaya'. The fourth volume

90. A copy of this paper is available at Śrī Pragñāsēkhara Library though a copy of it is not to be found even in the Catholic Press office today.

91. Lakminipahana, 3.7.1866.

of 'Vibhajja Vādaya' carried a controversy between Rev. David De Silva of the Wesleyan Mission and the editor regarding the authorship of the Bible.⁹²

Thus we note that only three Buddhist publications, namely 'Satya Mārgaya', 'Saddharma Sangrahaya' and 'Vibhajja Vādaya', one Catholic newspaper, 'Gñānārtha Pradīpaya', and one Reformed Church newspaper 'Satya Viniścaya' appeared during the eight years following 1864.

During this period printing presses in Colombo, apart from their main intention of printing religious literature, continued the new scheme which they had started in 1864 of introducing and printing literary works to be sold at a price. Most of these printed poetical works could be counted as religious in a way. Though these works had nothing to do with the contemporary 'religious war', they described events connected with Buddhism. Other books which were printed are connected with astrology and Eastern medicine, the two important fields of traditional knowledge. 'Lankābhinava Viśrta Press' printed 'Prātihārya Śatakaya' in 1864, a book which describes the miracle exhibited by Lord Buddha, by emitting water and fire through his nostrils at the same time, and continued this scheme of printing

92. D. P. Vijayasinha, Vibhajja Vādaya, Vol. 4, (February 1874), pp. 1-12.

religious poetical works of the past in the following years. In 1866, Lankābhinava Viśrta Press again paved the way by expanding the literary field in printing works connected with traditional learning. In that year Baṭuvantuḍāvē Pandit printed 'Śivalikhita', an astrological work, 'Nāmāṣṭa Śatakaya' and 'Vyāsakāraya', two primary readers in traditional education, and 'Kav Mutu Hara' of Kirama Dhammānanda, a poem associated with the power of the Buddha's teachings. No doubt the success of selling these printed works at a price created an economic attachment in the minds of the organisers of the printing press, which eventually ruined their original religious purposes. This can be exemplified by the edition of the entirely secular work 'Pārakumbā Sirita' in 1866 at Lakrivikirana Press by Don Phillip De Silva Āpā Appuhāmy, one of the founder members of Lankābhinava Viśrta Press. Baṭuvantuḍāvē's ceaseless pioneering efforts were followed by the owners of the other printing presses in Colombo. Lakminipahana Press printed 'Kōla Vidhiya' and 'Veda Haṭane', two medical works in verse, 'Anuruddha Śatakaya', a Sanskrit work associated with the traditional education of the Island and 'Nikini Katāva', a contemporary imaginative poem, in 1866, following them up with 'Nanda Mālaya', a collection of moral advice in verse,

'Pratya Śatakaya'(sic), a Sanskrit book connected with traditional learning, and 'Vṛtta Mālā Vyākhyāva', a prosodical work in Sinhalese in 1867 and 'Bauddha Śatakaya', an eulogy on Lord Buddha in Sanskrit, in 1868. Lakrivikirana Press printed 'Saṇḍakiṇḍuru Jātakaya', 'Pirinivan Jātakaya', 'Dunūvila Haṭanaya', 'Āhālēpola Haṭanaya', 'Gajabā Katāva' and 'Viraha Ratna Mālaya', poetical works of recent centuries, and 'Rōgāriṣṭaya', a medical poem in 1866; 'Aṣṭa Parīkṣāva', 'Nāḍi Kramaya', 'Vaidyālankāraya', three medicinal poems, and 'Īśvara Mālaya', also 'Gajaman Nōnāgē Prabandha' and 'Mīripānnē Prabandha', two anthologies of poems by two poets of the century, 'Siyabas Maldama' of the early nineteenth century and 'Pransa Nṛtya Kāvya' of Don Andiris Tuḍāvē Pandita Gunavardhana and 'Visama Taruni', two poems by living poets, were published in 1867 and 'Abhinava Jātaka Ratnaya', a book on astrology, in 1868. Sarvagña Śāsanābhivṛddhidāyaka Press, besides the religious publications of Mohoṭṭivattē Gunānanda, printed 'Andhabhūta Jātakaya', 'Sambulā Jātakaya', 'Vidhura Jātakaya', three poetical descriptions of the past lives of Buddha, of the eighteenth century, 'Lōvāda Saṅgarāva', an anthology of Moral advice to Buddhists, and 'Sītāmbraapaṭaya', a poem by a contemporary hand in 1866, and expanded the field

by printing 'Aśva Mukha Caryā Nimitta' and 'Yōgābharanaya', two astrological works, 'Jīvaka Ratna Gulīya', a medical work, 'Saṅgaraja Vata', the biography of Vālivīṭṭa Saranankara, 'Sakvala Vistaraya', 'Dolos Mahē Sivupada Pota', 'Vessantara Jātakaya', 'Ghānamantrī Katāva', 'Mōḍa Mālaya', 'Sinhavallī Katāva', 'Viyōga Mālaya' and 'Buddha Gajjaya', and in 1868 explored a new field by printing 'Kāma Ratnaya' and 'Strī Vilāsaya' on sexual knowledge. From 1866 we have evidence for the opening of new presses in the Island. A medical work, 'Ariṣṭa Śatakaya' was printed in a 'Buddhist Press' in 1866, 'Sulāmbāvatī Katāva' was printed in Kandy Press in the same year, and we come across another press which has some resemblance in name to Lakminipahana Press but is a quite different organisation, called 'Ilakminipalaṅga Press' in Colombo.⁹³

The lack of printed books in the libraries for the student of literary history and of any other source material of the calibre of the 'Classified Catalogue of Printed Tracts and Books in Singhalese' by Rev.J. Murdoch and Rev.J.Nicholson debar us from entering into conclusions on the gradual development in

93. All the material in regard to the printed poetical works was drawn from 'The Classified Catalogue of Printed Tracts and Books in Singhalese' by Murdoch and Nicholson. Most of the works mentioned here are now lost to the Sinhalese readers; what we can find now will be discussed in the fifth chapter.

introducing new poetic literature in Sinhalese after the year 1868. It can not be however unjustifiable if one concludes that the introduction of ancient and recent poetical works, contemporary imaginative poems, medical and astrological treatises in verse and the poetical works associated with traditional system of education would have expanded after 1868. The conversion of printing presses for the dissemination of literary and traditional knowledge thus started and spread in these four years was the only solution for these presses if they wanted to continue when the Buddhist leaders were engaged in the edition of Three Pitakas at Pāḷmaḍulla, turning away from religious controversy. The only press at Galle which was reluctant to adopt the new method for survival disappeared in no time.

Mohoṭṭivattē Gunānanda thus maintained the interest of the aggressive Buddhists throughout this period and was the sole responsible figure for maintaining religious propaganda among the Buddhists. His incomparably encouraging activities echoed in the hearts of the Buddhists and in the two decades before the arrival of the Theosophists in 1880 he was indubitably recognised as their religious leader. As soon as the edition of Vinaya Piṭaka was completed in 1868 his colleagues were released from their heavy duties at Pāḷmaḍulla. This

completion brought them the leisure to resume their earlier engagements. Unfortunately for him their business for the last seven years had changed their outlook and attitude towards the religious war. Their engagement in literary work for a long time seems to have diverted their interests from religious controversies. The year 1873 clearly shows the changed elements.

On first January 1873, appeared 'Samaya Sangrahava', a fortnightly magazine edited by Hikkaduṇṇē Sumangala nāyaka thera for 'Subhācāra Dharma Dīpti Samāgama' at Suratura Press which had been opened in 1872 by N.S. Fernando, a wealthy businessman in Colombo, and on the tenth of July 1873, 'Satya Samuccaya', another fortnightly magazine, was printed by Ratmalānē Dhammāloka nāyaka thera at the same press for the 'Dharmaparāyana Samāgama' in Colombo. The one and the only volume of 'Arut Saṅgarāva' too appeared in this year; though it was printed anonymously a close scrutiny would attribute the publication to Ratmalānē nāyaka thera.

These three publications are evidence for the birth of a new concept among scholars in respect to religion and literature. It appears that by that time they have accepted that the development of religion alone would do nothing for a nation unless it was combined with

literary development. In other words, the scholars realised that, after an ill-planned struggle for a decade in the religious field, they had done nothing for the development of literature and traditional learning. It seems that they determined to develop literature and knowledge among the people parallel with the religious interest. Thus we note that a new literary interest greater in proportion than the religious feelings was injected into the minds of these scholar bhikkhus, which gave a new outlook to the religious struggle compared with the previous seven years.

The introductory note of 'Samaya Sangrahava' says that it is concerned with materials on religion, education and worldly affairs.⁹⁴ 'Satya Samuccaya' too mentions the idea of developing Buddhism and other fields of literature.⁹⁵ The editor of 'Arut Saṅgarāva' acted differently and he separated religion from literature and published articles on various secular fields of knowledge and the affairs of the world.⁹⁶ All the three editors made it a point to be impartial in religious matters and not to be supporters of Buddhism as they had been before the edition of the Canon was made.

94. 'igena gata yutu dharma hā noyek śāstravalda, lōkacāritra pinisa karunut...'.
H. Sumangala, Samaya Sangrahava, Vol. 1, p. 1.

95. 'Śrī Lankādvīpa vāsiṅgē ubhaya lōkātha samsiddhiya saṇḍahā buddha dharmayada ... śāstrāgam pilibāṇḍa karunuda ...'.
H. Sumangala, Arut Saṅgarāva, Vol. 1, p. 1.

96. 'nānā vidha śāstra mārgat hā lōka cāritra da...'.
H. Sumangala, Arut Saṅgarāva, Vol. 1, p. 1.

The first volume of 'Samaya Sangrahava' contained articles mainly based on traditional knowledge, namely Sinhalese grammar, astrology and Eastern medicine, while the articles on religion discussed the Tooth Relic at Kandy and Rev.Gogerly's book, 'Kristiāni Pragnāpti'. In its later issues the editor preferred to publish articles on astrology, Eastern medicine and Sinhalese grammar rather than on Buddhism. The articles which we come across in the first volume of 'Satya Samuccaya' were written on the time cycles(kalpa Vibhāgaya), Sanskrit grammar, Eastern medicine and a verse composition in Sinhalese. The first volume of 'Arut Saṅgarāva' was devoted completely to literary articles, which had hardly any connection with Buddhism. It discussed twenty verses from the poem 'Kāvya Śēkharaya', which described the qualities of a king, with a paraphrase; a Sanskrit verse composition and stanzas of 'Caraka Samhitā' were paraphrased into Sinhalese, and another interesting article the Sinhalese readers read for the first time was a part of 'The Merchant of Venice' by William Shakespeare.

When the attitude to religion thus totally changed after the events at Pālmaḍulla, literature with its affiliated fields of knowledge were counted as more serious than Buddhism. Without the support of these

Buddhist writers, however, a hostile critic appeared in the existing Buddhist system with the publication of 'Nānōpāyini' in 1873. In one of the editorials the editor of this journal maintained that there can scarcely be any difference between the development of Christianity in Ceylon and the propagation of Buddhism in a country 'endowed with luxurious mansions as monasteries, colossal statues of Lord Buddha and selfish impious bhikkhus'. When the Rāmañña Nikāya through its organ thus criticised the existing state of Buddhism and the bhikkhus, those attacks were directly levelled at the bhikkhus whom we mentioned earlier as the leaders and defenders of Buddhism, since the allegations of the Rāmañña sect were made against the Siamese and Amarapura sects. While the Buddhist writers were facing this 'serious and destructive critic inside their own religion, the Wesleyan Mission, after witnessing these Buddhist publications, without understanding the reality of the situation foresaw the 'indicatory signs of a great struggle' that they would have to face in the month of August 1873.⁹⁷

Mohoṭṭivattē Gunānanda did not alter his path in the religious 'war' though his friends diverted their energy into literature, neglecting Buddhism. On nineteenth of June

97. Rev. J. Shipstone's letter on 8.8.1873,
MMS, Box 1868-1876, file 1868-1874.

1873, he delivered a lecture on the soul according to Buddhist teachings at the Wesleyan chapel, Pānadura, as a reply to a lecture delivered by Rev. David De Silva of the Wesleyan Mission at the same place on twelfth of June 1873.⁹⁸ These two lectures germinated the famous controversy at Pānadura on twentysixth and twentyeighth of August 1873. On the Christian side of a temporary (built) platform at Doṃbagahavatta, Pānadura, Rev. S. Coles, R. Tebb, C. Jayasinha, P. Rodrigo, Jos Fernando, J. H. Abhayasekhara, L. Nathanielsz, O. J. Gunasekara, Dr. Staples, Proctors Jayasinha, Daniel and Alwis, Susev De Soyza, F. S. Sirimanna and Hunupola Nilame were present.⁹⁹ Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala, Vaskaḍuvē Subhūti, Potuvila Indajoti, Koggala Sanghatissa, Talāhēnē Amaramoli, Mullēriyāvē Gunaratana and Mohoṭṭivattē Gunānanda represented Buddhism on the other side of the platform.¹⁰⁰ The discussion was based on the soul according to Buddhism and Christianity. Mr. Silva, 'a learned and fluent speaker full of Pali and Sanskrit has addressed the audience' but 'it is doubtful whether there were even thirty out of the five or six thousand who were present at the controversy who even understood' him. In contrast

98. Pānadurē Vādaya, (1955). p. 1.

99. John Capper, A Full Account of the Buddhist Controversy, held at Pantura, in August 1873, (Colombo), p. 5.

100. Idem, introduction, pp. iii-iv.

101. Idem, p. 4.

to the 'classical' language of Rev.David De Silva, Migeṭṭuvattē employed the 'plainest' and at one stage he remonstrated on the term used by Rev.David De Silva in calling him 'an opponent or adversary'.

On Wednesday 27 th the Christian clergymen decided to have a more suitable speaker, whose language could be understood by the common mass and selected F.S.Sirimanne,¹⁰² a catechist of the Church Missionary Society, an ex-Buddhist priest of the Galapāta temple, Bentara, as the orator of the Christian side on the next day.¹⁰³ The last speaker of the debate was Migeṭṭuvattē and he thanked the people for their attention, exhorted them to hold fast to Buddhism and then sat down. So ended this remarkable discussion.

Both parties believed in their own victory.¹⁰⁴ Those who sat on the platform to help Mohoṭṭivattē during the controversy left the premises and took no further action. It appears to the student of religious history that all the scholar monks had abandoned critical writings and aggressive works against Christians and unanimously appointed Mohoṭṭivattē Gunānanda as the representative

102. Some writers have written his name as J.S.Sirimanne, and The Satyālankāraya writes his name as F.T.Sirimanne.

103. John Capper, op.cit, p.35.

104. 'nobōdā Pānadurēdī keruna āgam vādāya karana koṭa gena Kristiāni āgamāṭa jaya lābī ehi satyatāvaya vaḍā dīptimat vunāyāyi Kristiānikārayō viśvāsa karana atara Buddhāgankārayin svakiya āgamāṭa jaya lābunāyayi prakāśa karati'
Satyālankāraya, 1.10.1873, p.4.

defender of Buddhism, while they took steps to develop knowledge in other fields. The proceedings of the debate were instantly translated into English by E.F. Perera, and John Capper, the special correspondent at the controversy and the editor of the Ceylon Times, printed them. These renderings reached the English-educated circles of the Island. The ministers of the Wesleyan Mission realised the danger and lamented over the inactive state of their brothers.¹⁰⁵ Mohoṭṭivattē who believed in the victory of the Buddhists started a lecture tour in the country with the intention of furthering their success.¹⁰⁶ The Wesleyan Mission organised counter lectures against Mohoṭṭivattē,¹⁰⁷ and after realising the power of their opponent started 'Satyālankāraya', a fortnightly newspaper, on 1.10.1873 with the collaboration of the Reformed Church and the Church of England against both the Buddhists and the Roman Catholics, and they were able to continue their campaign successfully over a decade.¹⁰⁸

Among the Roman Catholics the 'Gñānārtha Pradīpaya' continued without any economic hindrance at that time but with an awareness of the enmity shown towards them not only by the Buddhists but also by other Christian missions.

105. Letter of D.J. Gogerly to London, (undated).

106. Satyālankāraya, 13.5.1874, p. 136.

107. Satyālankāraya, 12.11.1873, p. 25,
G.E. Goonewardhana's letter on 15.11.1873.

108. Not a single copy of this 'paper' is available in Ceylon. Fortunately the British Museum preserves all its publications.

After the controversy at Pānadura, the Buddhists issued only one publication during the seven years up to the arrival of the Theosophists in 1880. The impartiality in religious matters expressed by 'Samaya Sangrahava' of Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala, and 'Arut Saṅgarāva' of Ratmalānē Dhammāloka, was highlighted when Charles Wickrema Gunaratna published 'Situminiruvana' on 10.7.1876 at Lankābhinava Viśrta Press at Māligākanda. The editor distinctly said that his newspaper would be devoted only to articles on scientific and literary fields, accepted the benefit conferred by Buddhism, Christianity and Islam on the world, and firmly declared its complete detachment from Buddhism.¹⁰⁹ As the press was in a room at the temple of Sumangala, Sumangala may have preferred the policy of religious non-commitment, since, as the principal of the Vidyodaya Oriental College he was in search of the favours of the Colonial government.¹¹⁰ Even this suggests that the original spirit evinced by Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala when he was in Galle as a foremost writer on Buddhism was lost by 1876. This paper was unable to go far.

'Satyālankārāya' in its long life span of ten years (when compared to all the other Sinhalese newspapers hitherto)

109. 'Śāstrānubaddha hevat vidyābhivardhanaya pinisa evana liyum saha kristu,bauddha,mahammat ādi siyalu labdhi -valama lovaṭa vāḍa vaḍana yahapat dharma prakāśa vū liyum da ...'

110. Every annual prize-giving of the Pirivena was represented by the Governor or his representative.

triumphantly devoted its full capacity to meeting its rivals among the Buddhists and the Roman Catholics. Though criticising the name 'Situminiruvana' at the beginning, criticism ceased when the changed attitudes of the Buddhist writers who contributed to it became clear. As a new arrival 'Satyāṅkārāya' in 'the struggling arena' vigorously encountered both Buddhist and Catholic opponents. There appeared unsettled controversies with 'Satya Samuccaya' of Vidyāṅkāra Pirivena,¹¹¹ and 'Samaya Sangrahava' of Vidyodaya Pirivena,¹¹² in the first two years and prolonged controversies with 'Gñānārtha Pradīpaya'.¹¹³ Every issue of Satyāṅkārāya brought to the eyes of the readers one or more controversial points and criticisms. Those

111. H.S.P., Sudharma Nikāṣaya Saha Satya Samuccaya Vādīhu, Satyāṅkārāya, 30.9.1874, p.200; 28.10.1874, p.227; 11.11.1874, p.234.

112. The report of the Panadura controversy and the article of 'Satyavādi' in Samaya Sangrahava were subjected to serious criticisms by Satyāṅkārāya. 15.10.1873, p.12; Mityāśastr, 12.11.1873, pp.31-32; John Adward Hunupola, 29.10.1873, p.24; Alōkakāmi, 26.11.1873, p.39; Attāṭa Priya, 24.12.1873, p.55.

The article entitled 'The Tooth Relic at Kandy' which appeared in Samaya Sangrahava, Vol.1, p.9, was attacked on 24.12.1873, p.54, by Satyēśanaya.

113. Reply to Sigmā, in Pradīpaya, on 2.1.1874, appeared in Satyāṅkārāya, on 4.3.1874, p.95. Reply to S in Pradīpaya, in Satyāṅkārāya, on 18.3.1874, p.103. Divās Prasādi, Kudrṣṭi tāpanaya, in Pradīpaya, on 22.5.1874, was attacked by the editor of Satyāṅkārāya, on 27.5.1874, p.140.

were all of a religious nature; the editor allowed space for literary debates at the later stages though he dispensed with them in his earlier issues. Buddhism and Roman Catholicism were considered as an elder brother and a younger brother of a same family with thirtyone common characteristics to be attacked.¹¹⁴

Thus the Buddhists could scarcely maintain their publications, and the Christian newspaper editors encouraged the Buddhists to believe that their inability to continue a newspaper or a magazine was due to the power of the Almighty God and advised the writers on Buddhism not to attack Christianity after witnessing the consequences of doing so. It is surprising to witness the general silence among both the Buddhists and the Christians. In the decade after the controversy at Pānadura, Satyālankārāya was the only survival in the sphere of religious writings. Even the solitary hero Migeṭṭuvattē selected another new way of fighting and did not engage in public debates on religion. Privately in his study he started an edition of Milinda Praśnaya,¹¹⁵ a description of a debate between king Milinda and the monk Nāgasēna. It is interesting to note here that the life of Migeṭṭuvattē had great affinities with that of

114. 'merata Rōmānu āgama saha Buddhāgamat malayat ayyat vagē eka mūnuvaraya', Satyālankārāya, 24.11.1875, pp. 487-488.

115. This edition was printed and published in 1878.

the priest Nāgasēna, the hero of the book.¹¹⁶ What prompted him to devote his time to such a personal study might remain a mystery if the social events of this period were not taken into consideration.

By that time ^{the} most dreadful and destructive social menace was spreading in ^{the} Sinhalese society under the leadership of two eminent Buddhist priests of the Siamese sect and Amarapura sect. Vāligama Sumangala nāyaka thera was commissioned by the Department of Public Instruction to compile the history of the Ceylonese for use in schools. In 1876 his book 'Itihāsayā', appeared. It was a verbatim translation of the sixth chapter of Mahāvamsa, which was scholastically presented. But it is apparent that there was another intention in compiling this book, fulfilled by the extensive usage of footnotes which occupied the larger portion of the book. While mentioning the eighteen castes (kula) who accompanied the Śrī Mahā Bodhi the author deliberately illustrated the superiority of the Karāwa caste and connected the origin of the caste to Kurukṣētra in India.

¹¹⁶. Both were great debators on Buddhism. Both might be considered Brahmins. Nāgasēna, was a Brahmin born in India and Migeṭṭuvattē was of Salāgama community who trace their origin to a Brahmana village called 'Salā', in India. And at the end both entered mysteriously into the order of the bhikkhus. Nāgasēna's parents wanted him to become a Brahmin proficient in Vedānta, and he entered the order at the hands of a priest who had been maliciously humiliated by his parents. Mohoṭṭivattē who had wanted to become a catechist in the Christian church, one evening without planning entered the order and delivered a sermon on the same day at Kumārakanda temple, in those days known as Gal Uḍa pansala.

Vāligama Sumangala's composition was not neglected by scholars like other writings in this field.¹¹⁷ In the following year 'Kēvaṭṭa Vamsāya hevat Itihāsa Khaṇḍanaya' appeared under a fictitious name P. Don Arnolis, but written by Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala nāyaka thera of the Siamese sect.¹¹⁸ Thus two nāyaka theras of Karāwa and Govigama castes started a furious 'caste war'. The sentiments of caste among the Sinhalese surpassed every other feeling. Caste consciousness was and is the most powerful force among them.¹¹⁹ Religious and other emotional feelings are thrown away in front of sensitive caste emotions. All the people of Karāwa caste united under the leadership of Vāligama Sumangala nāyaka thera, neglecting their religions. Thus ardent Christians and Buddhists got together against the Govigama caste. Since caste unity was felt as a stronger feeling than religion they united to protect their group identity. Vāligama Sumangala, the figurehead of the caste controversies and the protagonist of the

117. There were older poetical works written on caste, such as Janavamsa, Vitti Paṭuna, Bakamūnu Sandēsa, but these were generally ignored by the scholars.

118. This authorship will not be accepted by the Buddhists of present-day Ceylon, but it is given by H.C.P. Bell, who prepared the authors' list of names at the invitation of the governor in 1892.

119. This is glaringly clear in the politics of the country. The resignation of members of Parliament against the Press Bill in 1964 is a clear example. One can visualise politics in Ceylon as based on nothing else but on caste. Very recently scholarly articles written by University dons on caste were attacked by the president of Sakala - Kṣatriya Mahā Sabhā, an instant organisation for the purpose, in front of the University Commission. (Ceylon Daily News, 21.4.1972).

Karāwa caste, after the publication of Itihāsayā, and when criticisms were levelled against his theory, had spent the rainy season(vas) in the Coconut Grove of C.H.De Soyza, of Karāwa caste, who was a staunch Anglican.¹²⁰ Vāligama Sumangala frequently visited Soyza valavva, not to discuss religious matters but caste affairs,¹²¹ and Soyza erected Rankot Vihārāya at Pānadura and a temple at Haṅguranketa and offered the former to Vāligama Sumangala; and up to this date these temples are administered by the grandsons and great grandsons of Soyza, though they are not Buddhists.¹²² Besides this temple another temporary temple was built for Sumangala at the Valavuvatta by Soyza. Although C.H.De Soyza was connected in this manner with priests of the Buddhist church who were of Karāwa caste, even his name was poisonous to the Buddhist monks of the Govigama caste.¹²³

120. Ceylon Standard, 21.3.1905; Ceylon Independent, 15.3.1905.

121. T.S. Dharmabandhu, Kaurava Vamsa Katāva, (1949), p. 3;
T.S. Dharmabandhu, Sinhala Jātika Virayō, (1949), p. 30.

122. I am grateful to Winston Pieris and Jit Pieris, a grandson and a great grandson of Soyza, for this information.

123. Battaramullē Subhūti was a vehement critic of the Karāwa caste. His method of taking revenge was demonstrated when he started attacking the verses written by C. Don Bastian, in the dedication of his 'Soyzā Caritaya' to Lady Soyza, in 1904. The Varāṅga controversy was the result. Even now the accepted belief among Soyza's relatives in respect to his death is connected with this priest. Selina De Soyza Pieris, the youngest daughter of Soyza, who is in her 94th year, relates how her father died after being bitten by a rabid dog sent in the disguise of a magical messenger by Subhūti.

How these caste controversies influenced the religious field will be clear if we consider the position of Mohoṭṭivattē, the one and only leader who wrote and lectured for Buddhism against Christianity. Though he was a member of Salāgama caste he was recognised above his caste claims by the Buddhists. He had connections with Śailabimbārāmaya, where the bhikkhus and the devotees of the area are of Karāwa caste, and with Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala of Govigama caste. He could not support any caste, so he silently devoted his time to literary works as we mentioned above. His silence caused a pause in the religious struggle.

The incomparable Buddhist leader who thus became secluded when caste controversy invaded every field of the society, firmly believed in H.S.Olcott who professed his enmity to Christianity.¹²⁴ Mohoṭṭivattē accepted the word of Olcott and introduced him to all the accepted bhikkhu leaders despite their castes and sects. He hoped his dreams would come true when the Theosophists arrived in the Island. He prepared the ground for the expected struggle again. Satyālankārāya from the very beginning criticised the interest of the Buddhists in Theosophy. Sumangala's and Piyaṛatana's articles which appeared

124.Olcott's letter to Piyaṛatana nāyaka thera, written on 29.8.1878.

in the Theosophist magazine were criticised as anti-Buddhistic.¹²⁵ Mohoṭṭivattē's book 'T̥ibet Raṭē Buddhāgama', a compilation which he undertook after reading 'Isis Unveiled' by Blavatsky, met with serious criticisms from 'Adhigama',¹²⁶ 'Siglā',¹²⁷ and 'Laukika'.¹²⁸ Lakrivikirana attacked the Buddhist priests for their ignorance of Theosophy and warned them that they would repent in the future for helping them. The editor of Satyālankāraya after criticising the article of Piyyaratana cautioned the Buddhists on their futile attempts to be on friendly terms with the Theosophists. Since the Theosophists are believers in soul he asked the Buddhists why if they were prepared to believe in the soul they opposed Christianity?¹²⁹ However we can not say that these warnings were given with a pure intention. It seems to us that they felt afraid of their future if the Theosophists arrived in the Island. Their activities prove that they were shaken at the news of the Theosophists in Ceylon.

125. Satyālankāraya, 2.6.1880, p.166; 19.5.1880, pp.152-153.

126. Satyālankāraya, 23.5.1879, p.180; 30.7.1879, p.188.

127. Satyālankāraya, 20.8.1879, pp.255-256; 15.10.1879, p.204.

128. Satyālankāraya, 27.8.1879, pp.211-212.

129. Satyālankāraya, 13.8.1879, p.249.

The Wesleyan Mission also actively campaigned against the Theosophists in Ceylon. They were opposed by the priests of the mission at Pānadura.¹³⁰ Handbills were distributed at Kandy¹³¹ and sermons were held against Theosophy. Meanwhile 'Hingala', 'Kristiāni', 'Satyapriya', 'Buddha Vināśa', 'Dēsē Hāṭiyaṭa Bāsē', 'D.D', 'Samyak Acintayak', 'Buddha Samaya Acinatayak', 'Suruṭṭukāri', 'Satyaghōṣa', B.Perera, 'Vipat', 'Aṭapaṭṭam' and 'Na Ca Añño' not only advised the Buddhists on the lives of Olcott and Blavatsky, their morals,¹³² their inconsistency of ideas,¹³³ their acceptance of soul,¹³⁴ ignorance of Buddhism,¹³⁵ assistance to Hinduism in India,¹³⁶ and criticised them as 'new Buddhists' of the calibre of Kalundāvē Buddha,¹³⁷ but ridiculed them for exploiting the innocent Buddhists, in search of fair

130.H.S.Olcott, Old Diary Leaves, Second Series, pp.175-176; pp.190-196.

The Theosophist, Vol.1, No.11, (August 1880), p.263.

131.Ibid, p.181.

The Theosophist, Vol.1, No.10, (July 1880), p.258.

132.Satyālankārāya, 16.6.1880..

133.Satyālankārāya, 28.6.1880, p.192.

134.Satyālankārāya, 19.6.1880, p.174.

135.Satyālankārāya, 26.5.1880, p.164.

136.Satyālankārāya, 4.8.1880, pp.238-239.

137.A Buddhist priest from Kalundāva, near Kurunagala, pretended himself to be the Maitreya Buddha of the future and acted accordingly in 1870. Though the Sinhalese Buddhists use this idiom they have no idea how it originated. But Rev.J.Alcock reported about this Buddha in The Friend, No.1, (Second Series), January 1870, pp.10-12.

means of livelihood. Whatever may be the intention of these criticisms and expositions, the Buddhists themselves grabbed and warmly welcomed the founders of Theosophy to Ceylon as their leaders. Olcott's confessions of his hostility to Christianity were made only during his first short stay in the Island when the translators of his talks created an unforgettable image of Olcott ¹³⁸ in the minds of the Buddhists. But during his later visits he acted as if he had forgotten his enmity. He deliberately neglected that hostility and ordered the bhikkhus to refrain from preaching against Christianity and criticising it.¹³⁹ Those bhikkhus who had spent their time and energy in the revival of Buddhism, for the last eighteen years, including Mohoṭṭivattē Gunānanda at this time, became ardent uncritical admirers of Theosophy and obeyed their new Master forgiving their lifelong 'enemy'. During the collection of the Education Fund Olcott borrowed every avenue exploited by the Christians in these fields, such as Fancy bazaars and Till collections.¹⁴⁰ This made the Buddhists feel an amicable attitude to the Christians.

138. Olcott's translators elaborated his ideas according to their interpretation and feelings. Thus at Panadura, when Olcott says 'Christians' his translator translated it as 'the loitering dogs called Christians'.
Satyālankāraya, 30.6.1880, pp. 203-204.

139. The Theosophist, Vol. ii, No. 8, (May 1881), p. 30.

140. Satyālankāraya, the newspaper, had often reported the employment of these avenues to collect money among the Christians in Ceylon.

The successful activities carried out by the Buddhist Theosophical Society for over a decade completely altered the existing Sinhalese Buddhist society and the new lay leadership which emerged through these affairs largely overturned the recently induced religious sentiments among the Buddhists. 'Sarasavi Saṅḍarāsa', the organ of the Buddhist Theosophical Society started on 3.12.1880,¹⁴¹ made attempts to safeguard and defend Olcott, under the instructions of Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala.¹⁴² Mohoṭṭivattē Gunānanda, who revived his courage to continue the religious struggle after the arrival of the Theosophists, started 'Lakminikirula' on 15.5.1881,¹⁴³ but the powerful propaganda of the B.T.S forced him to retreat. Though he belatedly realised the folly committed by welcoming the Theosophists to the Island, he could do nothing as the B.T.S supplied a comfortable shelter for his opponents without caste and religious oppressions.

141. Śrī Sumangala Caritaya gives us a different date, that is 1883. (p.323). But Kalukoṇḍayāvē nāyaka thera has a copy of the paper dated 3.12.1880 and a criticism appeared in Satyālankāraya on 8.12.1880.

142. In the number one issue the editorial and another article were written by Sumangala. He praised the work of the B.T.S in the editorial and in the other article defended Olcott from the critics.

143. We have no available copy of Lakminikirula but we read of its appearance in the contemporary newspapers, such as Lakrivikirana, 21.5.1881; Gñānārtha Pradīpaya, 11.5.1881; Sarasavi Saṅḍarāsa, 13.5.1881.

It was this time a harder fight that Mohoṭṭivattē had to encounter. Before reaching the Christian enemy he had to meet with the attacks of the Rāmañña sect and the B.T.S, both sprung up inside Buddhism.

The new lay leadership which emerged through the B.T.S, Y.M.B.A and Buddhist National Congress were the benevolent products of Christian education. Dharmapala vehemently opposed the behaviour of Christian ministers and teachers¹⁴⁴ but comparatively had no hard feelings against Christianity.¹⁴⁵ He appreciated the teachings of Jesus Christ,¹⁴⁶ and he was more progressive with his ideals on religious toleration, but was out of time. He was more proficient in Christianity which he received under expert European tutors than in Buddhism, which he gathered through self acquisition.¹⁴⁷ He advocated religious harmony between the Christians and the Buddhists¹⁴⁸

144. One of his famous slogans was 'pādili rālālāṭa baya novellā'.

145. Return to Righteousness, edited by Ananda Guruge, (1965), The Repenting God of Horeb, p.406.

146. Ibid, An Appreciation of Christianity, p.445.

147. Any article written by Dharmapala exhibits this fact clearly. In an article written on 25.11.1922 in Sinhala Bauddhayā he cited three places from Buddhist literature in contrast to the fourteen quotations from the Bible.

148. 'Christians and Buddhists should unite and work for the elevation of the Sinhalese people', Idem, p.510.

and was against the oppression of a human being for his inner conviction.¹⁴⁹ In 1893, at the World Parliament of Religions, he publicly declared his acceptance of the 'so nice and sweet common teaching brought by the Theosophists to Ceylon, that is, abuse not the religion of others'.¹⁵⁰ And it was not only Dharmapala; the whole lay leadership was in the hands of 'indifferent Buddhists'.

The editor of *Sarasavi Saṇḍarāsa*, Hemendra Sepala Perera, and the Secretary of the Y.M.B.A, C.S.Disānāyaka, were converted Buddhists but their relatives including their wives were ardent Christians. L.C.Wijesinha, one time editor of *The Buddhist*, the English organ of the Theosophists, was a converted Buddhist and the son of the first native minister of the Wesleyan Mission. Though A.E.Buultjens, the other editor of *The Buddhist*, deserted Christianity, all his relatives remained Christians. In a country where the family influence is so highly esteemed one can hardly do anything of one's own. How insignificant religion became in this new society could well be seen in 'The Kara-Goi Contest with the strongly-worded appeal to the House of Commons in England' by G.A.Dharmaratna, the senior Sinhalese advocate in Ceylon,

149.Op.cit, *The Psychology of Hearing*, p.271.

150.The Theosophical Congress,(1893),p.28.

who himself was a Christian, in 1890.

"Even at this day the Bishop of Colombo and the clergyman in charge of the All Saints' Church of Colombo might be mortified and grieved to find if they should employ a faithful spy, that most of the ladies and gentlemen who attend the church regularly, who invite big wigs to be present at the marriage ceremonies of their daughters and who imagine that additional blessings descend on the new couple when the marriage is solemnized by the prelate or his second, have secluded rooms in which images of Buddha¹⁵¹ are placed, to whom flowers are offered on due days."

Most of the new lay leaders were married to Christian families. 'It was alarming' once wrote the editor of *Sarasavi Saṇḍarāsa* 'to see the youths who read at the temples books like 'Sati Paṭṭhāna' and 'Buddha Ādahilla' now kneeling at the altars with crosses over their chests after their marriages'.¹⁵² Piyadasa Sirisena, the novelist, nicknamed this system of marriage as 'Istrianity'.¹⁵³ D.B.Jayatillaka, the president of the Y.M.B.A and the Buddhist National Congress, married Baṭuvantudāvē Pandita's daughter whose mother was

151.G.A.Dharmaratna, *The Kara-Goi Contest with an Appeal to the House of Commons*, (1890), p.24.

152.*Sarasavi Saṇḍarāsa*, 2.1.1901.

153.To become a Christian to marry an 'istriya' or woman.

a Christian.¹⁵⁴

The coming of this lay leadership in the religious activities of the Island is a clear sign of religious tolerance, and shows that the religious enmity in the hearts of the Buddhists was swept away at the end of the nineteenth century. These affairs indicated a new era, where religion was insignificant in comparison with national feelings. The finest example of this religious reconciliation was the acceptance offered as leaders to the two cousins who believed in two separate religions before the end of the century.

154. Baṭuvantudāvē married the daughter of Bulatsinhala Ranamuka Rājakarunā Daluvaḍana Mudiyansēlāgē Siman Appuhāmy or Siññō. (L.W.De Silva, Baṭuvantudāvē Caritaya, (1911), p.8.). This biography was written later by a Christian, but general approval of the statement is shown by the fact that none opposed it. But the editors of the Buddhist Encyclopaedia, attempt to hide the actual truth by saying that he had to solemnize his marriage at the church since there were no Buddhist registrars of marriages in those days; that he launched a struggle against this and that a new post was created in 1888 for a Buddhist Registrar. (Buddhist Encyclopaedia, edited by G.P.Malalasekera, Vol.ii, p.572) Baṭuvantudāvē was 69 then and one can only admire the tenacity of his struggle.

John De Silva, the playwright and dramatist, a Christian,¹⁵⁵ was welcomed by the Buddhists with the same enthusiasm as they accorded to his cousin, Battaramullē Subhūti therā, who wrote 'Durvādi Hrdaya Vidāranaya', a polemical poetical work against Christianity.

-
155. John De Silva, a born Christian, married thrice to Christian families, and on Sundays he attended service with the family. Before marrying Selestina Perera, in 1879, he dedicated 'Kav Gele Dama' to her, which narrates the life of the prophet Jonah. This work is unknown in Ceylon among Sinhalese scholars but a criticism of the book with some verses could be read in Satyālankāraya on 5.11.1879. At the beginning he paid homage to God.
- 'nitara namadim bāti sitin apa tiyeka deviñdun lovuturā'
- Not a single person of this generation is ready to accept him as a Christian, due to the scarcity of information. The famous Nurti songs such as 'Dannō budungē śrī Dharmaskhandā' and 'muni sāsana vamsē' in Śrī Saṅgabō Nāṭakaya did not appear in the first edition in 1903, but come in the next edition in 1907. After his third wife's death, in 1906, there appeared a tendency towards Buddhism. At the beginning of Uttara Rāma Caritaya, he printed 'namo tassa' and in Ratnāvali in 1906 appears a song 'sādā pāda muniñdugē mā sirasē'. In 1915 he declared his faith in Buddhism in Alakēśvara Caritaya.
- When the present writer engaged in a research project on Tower Hall Theatre, in 1969 and 1970, none of the actors who had been with him knew he was ever a Christian. I am grateful to H.S.P. Coloṃbatantri, his great nephew, for this fact which became clear to me when going through his writings in London which I can not find in Ceylon.

Though it might be a heartbreaking position for a religious zealot, to witness unexpected religious tolerance of this nature, this state of affairs did a marvellous service in the development of new poetical literature in Sinhalese. Those printing presses which started with religious enthusiasm in the sixties became mints of money and a printing press was considered as a -- 'money finder'. The pioneers of the Buddhist movement considered the 'community' (sāṅghika) presses as their personal property and named their sons and relatives as heirs after their death. Lankābhinava Viśṛta Press was severely criticised on this point.¹⁵⁶ Other wealthy businessmen opened presses in every town of the Island before the end of the century. To cater to these presses literary works were needed. Editions of older texts came out in groups. New imaginary writings, and works on day to day events and problems of society came into the hands of the public through these presses, mostly in verse.

(By) considering these facts we can see that the evolution of the new poetic tradition in Sinhalese literature and the renewed interest in traditional knowledge was the immediate result of a religious interest manifested against Christian writings in 1862.

156. Satyālankāraya, 14.12.1881, Buddhāgamē Accu Yantra, p.400;
Kavata Katikayā, 1.2.1908.

When (the) religious enthusiasm languished due to various forces, the next generation was presented with a vast amount of new poetical compositions, along with the re-emergence of traditional scholarship in Ceylon, which we will consider in the next three chapters.

Chapter four

RE-EMERGENCE AND DEVELOPMENT OF TRADITIONAL LEARNING

Religion has inevitably played a dominant role in the fields of literary history and traditional learning in Ceylon. Buddhism and the Sangha community functioned as interrelated institutions with traditional knowledge and literature. Poetic literature in Sinhalese developed simultaneously with the traditional scholarship. In this chapter we will discuss the recovery of the traditional learning which gave birth to a new poetic literary tradition in Sinhalese in this period, after the disorganization which occurred as a result of foreign invasions and internal social and political vicissitudes, from the sixteenth century.

Decadent Buddhism with its other affiliated institutions were reformed after the establishment of the Higher Ordination in 1753, which was brought from Siam under the instructions of Vālivīṭa Saranankara, the last Sangharāja of Ceylon. Saranankara Sangharāja was not only a pious and dedicated bhikkhu in religious matters, but a monk with a massive mental curiosity in educational fields. His biographies are clear evidence of the difficulties

he underwent in exploring the remains of language and literature.¹

In his educational institute at Niyamakanda temple, he engaged in diffusing this knowledge, which he had acquired through great persistence, to the Silvat Sāmanēra Samāgama, popularly known as Vālivīṭa Unnānsēgē Samāgama. But after the establishment of Upasampadā or Higher Ordination under the auspices of the then ruler of the Island, this traditional seat of learning was moved to Malvatta monastery where the Sangharāja was offered residence at that time. The newly formed Siamese sect, with Malvatta monastery as its headquarters or mūlasthānaya from the second half of the eighteenth century, thus claimed recognition not only as the sacred place for religious observances, since the Sāmaneras or Novices were taken there to receive their Higher Ordination, but also as a seat of learning, as the Novices who had gained a fair knowledge in reading and writing under their teachers at village temples approached Malvatta in search of further knowledge.

Vidyāratna Rājaguru Baṇḍāra of Attaragama, the cleverest pupil of Vālivīṭa Saranankara Sangharāja, engaged in teaching those pupils at Malvatta monastery.

1. Āyittāliyaḍḍē Muhandiram, Sangharāja Sādhā Cariyāva, edited by N. Paṇḍāsena and P. B. Sannasgala, (1947), pp. 2-6.

All the bhikkhus and laymen who were eminent for their contribution to poetry in Sinhalese and scholarship of the first half of the nineteenth century received their education at Malvatta under the guidance of Rājaguru Bandāra. Those bhikkhus who received their Higher Ordination and further education at Malvatta monastery brought down the traditions of religious life and educational achievements to the next generation of monks, and the disciples of those priests were responsible for the development of the Sangha community and the traditional learning of the Island. This system of receiving the Higher Ordination and gaining knowledge at Malvatta gave rise to a remarkable practice which may have existed earlier among the community of bhikkhus called pupillary succession or śiṣyānuśiṣya paramparāva.

The pupillary succession counts much in the formation of the Sangha community and it is a constant factor in the structure of Buddhism and learning in the Island. In order to get a clear view of this unchanging succession I will make attempts to examine how the pupillary succession was transfigured between the death of Vāḷiviṭṭa Saranankara and the beginning of the period under discussion.

Vālivita Saranankara's faithful colleague ²

Siṭṭināmaluvē Dhammajoti of Kahaṇḍava temple was the founder of the newly instituted bhikkhu tradition ³ and the literary tradition of the low country in this period. Vēhāllē Dhammadinna and Karatoṭa Dhammārāma the two pupils of Siṭṭināmaluvē Dhammajoti are to be credited as the successors and the originators of the pupillary succession in the Sangha community of the low country including Sabaragamuva province. If we scrutinise the activities of these two monks then we will be able to locate the beginning of a twofold pupillary succession of bhikkhus in Ceylon. Vēhāllē Dhammadinna functioned as the chief of the Sangha or nāyaka of the low country,

-
2. Though Sangharāja Sādhu Cariyāva and other documents of the Siamese sect mention the names of Ginigatpiṭṭiyē Sangharakkhita thera, Māḍavela Ānanda thera, Galagedara Indajoti thera, Tibbaṭuvavē, Siddhārtha, Kadirāgoḍa priest of Diyahunnata temple, Ilipangamuvē priest of Tissava temple, Mālimboḍa priest of Velagama temple, as the colleagues and disciples of the Sangharāja, information in respect of their achievements is not available now.
 3. Siṭṭināmaluvē Dhammajoti of Durāva caste was the constant colleague of the Sangharāja, when he was in search of knowledge. Both received Upasampadā together at Malvatta. But the writers of the history of religion in the next generation have maliciously distorted the facts. They turned the colleague into a pupil and denounced his name from the list of bhikkhus who received Higher Ordination with Saranankara. Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala protested at W.F. Gunavardhana for mentioning the truth. W.F. Gunavardhana, Guttala Kāvya Varṇanā, Second edition, (1916), Introduction, p. xvii, footnote.

the chief incumbent of Pāḷmaḍulla temple and Potgul temple of Sabaragamuva, and the organiser of offerings to Adam's Peak(Samanala Pūjā).⁴ As there was no systematic order of bhikkhus in the low country in the second half of the eighteenth century, these monks indefatigably attempted to develop the community of the Sangha by recruiting (new) Novices into the Order. It seems by that time there existed a large number of village temples without responsible monks. The admission of boys into the bhikkhu order established these ruined temples as monasteries endowed not only with bhikkhus but also with lay devotees. The pupillary succession of monasteries was thus founded in the low country and it is carefully followed even at the present moment, with slight alterations but adhering to those same rules.

Vēhāllē Dhammadinna, a bhikkhu of the Beravā or drummer caste, of Kahaṇḍagala temple, Tangalle, the chief of the Sangha of the low country, after enriching the Sangha community by giving Ten Precepts to those boys where there were village temples was recognised as the head of the Vēhāllē group or Vēhāllē Paramparāva.⁵ Throughout the low country his tradition spread and in due

4. Veheragampiṭṭa Nandārāma, Karatōṭa Vata, (1940) Mātara, p.4.

5. The expulsion of this group was successfully carried out by the bhikkhus of the same sect who were of Govi caste, and this group was called 'Naṭṭam Samāgama' after the caste of Vēhāllē's teacher Siṭṭināmaluvē.

The Ceylon Independent 24.3.1910

J.B.Perera, Niti Ratnāvalī, (1914) p.75 and pp.139-140.

course in spite of the fact that the next generation disclaimed their connections with the group under the fanatical feelings of caste, this tradition still prevails under various other titles inside the Siamese sect. Vaṭaraggoḍa Dhammapāla who severed his association with the Vēhāllē group established Mulgiri Paramparāva or Mulgiri group at Mulgiri Raja Mahā Vihāraya. Vāva Indasāra headed the Vāva group or Paramparāva, at Hittatṭiyē Raja Mahā Vihāraya. Some of his pupils went to the Bōdhimalu Ārāmaya, Bentara, and by the passage of time when some other temples were added to this mūlasthānaya it was named Bōdhimalu Paramparāva.⁶ Pallattara Puññasāra of Kacciyavattē temple, Galle, resurrected the tradition which had existed at Toṭagamu Vihāraya, or Ratpat Vihāraya, or Vijayabāhu Pirivena, in 1782. Kāṭagoḍa Ratanajoti of Yaṭagala temple, Galle, headed the Kāṭagoḍa group while Agalakaḍa Dhammarakkhita of Agrabōdhi Vihāraya, Vāligama, founded Agalakaḍa Paramparāva and some of his disciples approached Sapugōḍa Vihāraya at Bēruvala and established the Sapugōḍa group at that temple.

A religious pupillary succession of this nature was deliberately followed by the heads of these groups in order to spread the number of temples and monks of that group. It served the spread of the monasteries and the

6. Veheragampita Nandārāma, op.cit. p.5.

bhikkhus in the low country which was one necessity in the reconstruction of Buddhism. But it hardly had a worthwhile effect in the sphere of knowledge and education. A large number of villages where dilapidated monasteries were available were undoubtedly put under the protection of the head of a group who lived in the Raja Mahā Vihāraya, or Purāna Vihāraya, or Mūlasthānaya. All the small temples in a province were considered as the subordinate temples of that main temple. From the boys who come to the village temple to receive their first lessons in reading and writing, to locate the boy with a bright future as a bhikkhu is a special talent of a nāyaka priest. If the boy has a good successful horoscope (kēndaraya)⁷ which nevertheless forces him to detach from

7. Dr. Richard F. Gombrich is misinformed on this point. (Precept and Practice, Oxford, 1971, p. 147). Though there prevails a popular belief among those who are ignorant of astrology that the possessor of a horoscope where the 1, 4, 7 and 10 Houses are not governed by planets (hatara kēndaraya pālu) is suitable for ordination, this does not seem to follow in Ceylon, if one examines the horoscopes of the bhikkhus. I will show three horoscopes of eminent priests, Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala nāyaka thera, the first principal of Vidyodaya Pirivena, Ratmalānē Dharmārāma, the second principal of Vidyālankāra Pirivena, and Kalukonḍayāvē Paññāsekara, the present principal of Vidyodaya Pirivena respectively.

Footnote continued...

worldly affairs he will with the consent of his respectable, socially accepted parents' end his lay life by becoming a Novice or a Sāmanera under his priest teacher. From the moment he enters the Order he is fitted into the pupillary succession as a pupil (śiṣya) of a teacher (ācārya). The teacher may have more pupils, but the first pupil or Pradhāna śiṣya is entitled to be the hereditary successor to the temple owned by his teacher. Other disciples of the ācārya have no claims on the teacher's property. The Pradhāna Śiṣya after entering the Order may not show signs of

continued....

Guru Ravi Candra Rāhu		Sani
	Sinha lagnam	
Sukra Budha	Kuja	Ketu

Sukra Guru Ketu	Ravi Budha	Kuja
	Kanyā lagnam	
		Sani Sukra Budha Ketu

Guru Ketu		Candra
	Mithuna lagnam	
Sani Sukra Kuja	Ravi	Rāhu Budha

At a glance one will notice that these are not the horoscopes of the 'hatara kēndaraya pālu' group. They could have been equally successful if they were laymen. In contrast I am aware of a few laymen with the horoscopes of this unlucky calibre who are successful as Public servants and businessmen. But there may be a handful of monks who claim a horoscope where all the great Houses are without planets or the gaze (penima) of a planet. Those were the boys who were offered to the Church (sāsanayaṭa pūjā karapu) in order to be relieved from constant illness caused by bad effects of a horoscope. It is not compulsory even to ordain these boys. No priest would like to have a boy with an unsuccessful horoscope to entertain into the Order as his 'śiṣya'.

scholarship but even without recognition as a scholar he will end up as the chief incumbent of the temple and one day will admit boys into the Order under his ācāryaship.

Unfortunately this religious pupillary succession (Pravṛjyācārya Paramparāva) was not a galvanic force in the field of traditional learning. This is quite obvious when one sees that the groups which we mentioned earlier as Paramparā, which arose out of the religious pupillary succession, were in no way able to produce a single scholar in the period which we discuss here. But I believe a privileged sub-system which underlies the bhikkhu community gave birth to another type of pupillary succession which did enrich the traditional knowledge and literature.

In a Purāṇa Vihāraya or Raja Mahā Vihāraya or Mūlasthānaya there was always a bhikkhu who was proficient in traditional knowledge, but who had no claims on the monastic property. His main efforts were devoted to the circulation of that knowledge among the Novices who came from subordinate temples. Among these students there may be a Novice who comes from a remote village temple with gifted talents for learning. When such a rare chance occurs the bhikkhu who teaches the Novice will consent at the Higher Ordination ceremony to participate as one of his

8. Some temples followed this system even in the Pirivena age. At Hādidemalākanda Purāṇa Vihāraya in my village I remember that we had a nāyaka hāmuduruvō and a Paṇḍita hāmuduruvō.

ācāryas. Thus the Novice enters the scholarly pupillary succession of his new ācārya. At this point we witness the origin of a scholarly pupillary succession in the Sangha community which may be called 'Dharmācārya Paramparāva'.

Despite the meagreness of sources available to the student we are in a position to recognise the development of this scholarly pupillary tradition among the bhikkhus of this period. Karatoṭa Dharmārāma, the other pupil of Siṭṭināmaluvē Dhammajoti, was taught at the feet of Attaragama Rājaguru Bandhāra.⁹ After the death of his colleague, Vēhāllē Dhammadinna, Karatoṭa was presented with the nāyakaship of Śrī Pāda along with the title of chief of the Sangha of the low country in 1783. Karatoṭa Dharmārāma of Vēragampiṭa Vihāraya, Mātara, had a tendency not to admit an innumerable quantity of Novices into the Order, but rather to circulate the traditional knowledge and scholarship among those who sought for it. He was a poet¹⁰ and a scholar.¹¹ He started a seat of learning at Vēragampiṭa Raja Mahā Vihāraya, and those who were in search

9. 'Tika raja guru gōla Damram yati ruvana'

10. His only famous authentic literary work was the poetic riddle entitled 'Baranama Gaba Saka', three verses written in such an order that they could be read and interpreted as twelve verses.

11. His fame as a scholar echoed in the following verse.

'Karatoṭa Bōvala da Gāl' Akurāsi	namina
Kirama da kiṇḍu Denagama Damkit	paṭuna
tera sat Galāṭumbe dam bahu	vaṭina
parasidu samat yati raṭa pāta me	paṃana'.

of traditional scholarship approached him there. Bhikkhus from insignificant temples received education at Karatoṭa's seat of learning. Gāllē Medhankara, Kaṭukurundē Dhammānanda, Mīripānnē Dhammaratana and Bentara Atthadassi became eminent for the learning which they gained at Vēragampiṭa Raja Mahā¹² Vihāraya. As we have no evidence in respect to the lives of these scholarly bhikkhus, it may not be unreasonable if one argues that some of them might have received the Higher Ordination at Malvatta, with Karatoṭa Dharmārāma their 'Dharmācārya' as their new teacher. Since Karatoṭa was the nāyaka thera of the low country, the religious teachers (pravṛjyācārya) of the disciples would have undoubtedly consented to accept the nāyaka thera as the ācārya of their pupils, which would give immeasurable benefits in the future to the disciples.¹³ Even though it seems (an arguable) affair as no records are available to this generation, we are certain that these pupils whom we have mentioned belong to the same scholarly tradition as Karatoṭa Dharmārāma and were the continuation links of the present generation of scholars with the old school of Malvatta.

12. Valagedara Dhammadassi, Heṭṭigoḍa Sumangala and Akmīmana Sāmi, who later became a Christian, were his other pupils. W.F. Gunavardhana says that Mīripānnē Dhammaratana was a pupil of Kaṭukurundē Dhammānanda. W.F. Gunavardhana, op.cit Introduction, p.xxi.

13. Even now the Sāmanera who goes to Malvatta for his Upasampadā has to get a letter of introduction from the nāyaka thera of the province.

Gāllē Medhankara, who may have come from a subordinate temple of Galle, after his studies went to Pālmaḍulla Purāna Vihāraya which had come into the hands of his scholarly teacher, Karatoṭa, as the chief of Adam's Peak. He had no claims to the temple wealth when one considers the religious pupillary succession, but being a scholar he devoted his time to establishing a massive educational institute at Purāna Vihāraya. Students from the low country arrived and received their education at Pālmaḍulla.

After the death of Attaragama Rājaguru Baṇḍāra, the seat of learning at Malvatta, it appears to us, must have disappeared since we have no evidence of its existence. This may be one of the reasons for the flourishing of the new institute of learning at Pālmaḍulla. The death of Gāllē Medhankara, the principal of the educational institute, occurred in 1837. But it did not prevent the continuing of education at Purāna Vihāraya, as the deceased was so fortunate as to have an eminent pupil at his feet as his successor. Inḍuruvē Sumangala Medhankara succeeded his teacher at the Pālmaḍulla seat of learning and handled the establishment with great prudence and in no time he taught Valānē Siddhattha, a Novice who exhibited signs of a bright future in his student days.

Valānē Siddhattha was a Novice from an insignificant temple¹⁴ of Ratmalāna area of whose religious pupillary succession we are hardly aware.¹⁵ But his scholarly pupillary succession is clearly exhibited in the foregoing discussion. Though his religious surroundings were unimportant, the reputation brought to him as an erudite scholar at Pālmaḍulla tempted the lay devotees of Ratmalāna Purāna Vihāraya to extend an invitation to Siddhārtha to observe the rainy season(vas) in 1838 at their temple. This custom of inviting a recognised monk to temples during the rainy season has greatly helped the growth of traditional learning and the interest in religion. The bhikkhu who arrived at the temple organised religious festivals (vas pinkam) at nights and in the daytime spread knowledge among the village boys and Novices of the temple and adjoining monasteries. Valānē Siddhārtha's fame as a scholar brought an immense benefit to Purāna Vihāraya and Novices from various parts of the low country were taken there by their religious teachers for studies. The warm hearts of the lay devotees of Ratmalāna temple did not allow Valānē to return to Pālmaḍulla or to Valānē temple and he was persuaded to reside at Ratmalāna Purāna Vihāraya.

14. The temple built at this place to commemorate Valānē therā is now known as 'Valānē Siddhatthārāmaya'.

15. Giddava Gunaratana is believed to be his religious teacher. Sidat Vata, the biography of Siddhattha printed in 1869, does not supply any news of this priest.

From 1839 a seat of learning was thus started at Ratmalāna. During the lifetime of Induruvē Sumangala Medhankara, the Pālmaḍulla seat of learning supplies us with no news regarding its activities. But it may be assumed that its influence continued to be felt for a long time and even in 1852, though it had become less famous when the successful seat of learning arose at Ratmalāna, Christian educationists bitterly complained of the opposition created by this school. The Inspector of Christian Vernacular Schools in his report declared that the failure to keep up the Pālmaḍulla school in a satisfactory state was due to the influence of the temple and its education which was given by the Buddhist priests.¹⁶ Induruvē Sumangala Medhankara was still living in 1868 according to the sources. But we have no evidence about his activities in the school after the foundation of a seat of learning at Ratmalāna.

Bentara Atthadassi, one of the disciples of Karatoṭa Dharmārāma, after his studies at Vēragampitā Vihāraya came to Vanavāsa Vihāraya, his village temple at Bentara, and organised a seat of learning there. He copied manuscripts and built up a massive library at the temple. The doubts he entertained on some points accepted by the bhikkhus of his scet gave birth to religious controversies.

16. See 'The Development of Public Education in Ceylon (1832-1869)', unpublished M.A. thesis submitted by C. Godage to the University of London, (1962), pp. 314-315.

From 1846, his theories on alms giving, calculation of the leap year and casting horoscopes created a great upheaval among the bhikkhus of his sect, which later led to the disruption of the Siamese sect, and in 1856 Atthadassi formed the Kālāṇi branch of the Siamese sect. These events tempted those pupils who were in~~at~~thirst for knowledge to go to Bentara Vanavāsa Vihāraya. Atthadassi's erudition is reflected in all aspects of learning and religious affairs of this period. He expired in 1862,¹⁷ having taught Āmbagahavattē Saranankara, the founder of the Rāmañña sect, Vāligama Sumangala, the founder of the caste controversies and a scholar in Sanskrit, Yātrāmullē Dharmārāma, the instructor of Pali to Western scholars, Potuvila Indajoti, famous native physician, and Kōmmala Indasāra, the composer of Katīsēru Baliya and some other¹⁸ versifications employed by the exorcists in their rituals. I have made attempts in the first chapter to illustrate the complications which appeared in the field of religion owing to the theories of Bentara Atthadassi and his successors.

17. Literary historians have incorrectly dated his death as 1845.

P.B. Sannasgala, *Sinhala Sāhitya Vamśaya*, (1966) p. 640
 K.H. De. Silva, *Sinhala Navakatāvē Purōgāmiyā*, (1966) p. 445,
 But Yātrāmullē Dharmārāma writes thus to R.C. Childers on 22.1.1870. '1862 dī kālakriyā kala apagē ācārya vū Atthadassi sthaviṛayan vahansēṭa punya dānaya pinisa pinkamak karaṇḍa lāstiya tibenavā'. OR 2258.

18. Two other names are mentioned as pupils in the later writings. Karatoṭa Vata mentions Māvāllē Sāmi and Sāliālē Sāmi, (p. 63), while W.F. Gunavardhana gives the names of Vārāllānē and Bentotoṭa.

Mīripānnē Dhammaratana, the scholarly pupil of Karatoṭa Dharmārāma and the religious pupil of Kaṭukurundē Dhammānanda of Galle, after his education started a seat of learning in his village temple, Padumārāmaya, at Mīripānnē. His scholarship was incomparable; he was responsible for diffusing knowledge and theories concerning Sinhalese poetry and this seat of learning carried down the Sinhalese poetical tradition to the next generation of Sinhalese poets. The first specimens of poetry we come across of this period are of this school. From the verses of Koggala Dhammatilaka in 1853, up to the poems of Battaramullē Śrī Subhūti the last priest poet of the period, all were traditionally accepted and claimed as the followers of the poetic tradition of the Mīripānnē school.¹⁹ As the founder of the school was a member of the Durāva caste, he was not allowed to enter the religious pupillary succession of Vālivīṭa Saranankara of the Siamese sect. Koggala Dhammatilaka (later known as Don Johannas Paṇḍitatilaka Koggala Gurunnānsē) the protagonist of Sav sat dam vādaya, after his teacher's death assumed duties at the school.

19. Battaramullē at the start of the controversy on Guttila Kāvya Varnanā of W.F. Gunavardhana, congratulated the tradition of Mīripānnē in Viduliya, Vol. 1 No. 1 (1.12.1908), p. 1 (Mīripānnē ācārya paramparāvaṭa stuti vāvā).

pavara Mīripānnē parapuren	ena
gāmburu kav satara yasa paratera	pāmīna
mevara vasana nama dasa desa pasiṇḍu	vana
pavara Sirisubhuti maha kiviṇḍun	visīna.

Don Andiris Tuḍāvē Paṇḍita Gunawardene, a poet and a scholar, Siṭṭināmaluvē Dharmārāma or Siṭṭināmaluvē the Junior (Devāni Siṭṭināmaluvē), Don Johānis Vijēsinha Jayawardene Muhandiram, Andiris Dhīrasēkera, Talarambē .Dhammakkhandha, Tangallē Sumanatissa, Maḍihē Siri Sumitta, Daluvattē Jinānanda and Kaṭukurundē Gurunnānsē²⁰ were all scholarly pupils of Mīripānnē Dhammaratana, who died on 30.4.1851.

Thus at the beginning of the period which comes under ²¹our discussion, the Siamese sect was endowed with three principal seats of learning at Ratmalāna Purāna Vihāraya, Bentara Vanavāsa Vihāraya and Mīripānnē Ariyākara Vihāraya under the guidance of Valānē Siddhattha, Bentara Atthadassi and Koggala Dhammatilaka. But the decade which started in 1852 could not be considered as a period in which learning (has) flourished. Bentara Atthadassi and his theory on the leap month was supported by Valānē Siddhattha of Ratmalāna educational institute. Both Bentara and Valānē met critical opposition from the Mahānāyakas of Malvatta and Asgiriya. Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala, one of the famous pupils of Valānē Siddhattha who started a school in 1848 to distribute

20.W.P.Ranasinha(compilor),Mīripānnē Prabandha,(1867) Introduction,p.iii.

21.Mīripānnē too I include in the Siamese sect as we do not find any reference to his higher ordination.After the establishment of Dharmarakṣita Nikāya his pupils may have entered that sect.But Mīripānnē died without leaving the Siamese sect, Koggala Dhammatilaka disrobed before 1862 and Tuḍāvē Sumanasāra gave up robes before 1859. They did not leave the Siamese sect.

knowledge in his village temple, Tilakārāmayā, Hikkaduva, acted against his teacher's view. With the assistance of Hikkaduvē Sumangala, the budding scholar of the Island, the Mahānāyakas waged a 'war' against the theories of Bentara and Valānē. This state of religious rivalry culminated in 1856. The leaders of the newly founded Kālāṇi branch of the Siamese sect launched a tedious struggle to gather more temples to their side, and this may not have allowed Bentara and Valānē to devote much time or energy to the educational activities in the seats of learning at Bentara and Ratmalāna. Malvatta did not recognise the birth of the Kālāṇi branch and excluded them from the community of bhikkhus. Since Malvatta had been accepted as the sacred place to receive the Higher Ordination, most of the teacher priests might have discouraged their pupils from attending these educational institutes. All the teacher priests had to rely on the goodwill of Malvatta to see ^{that} their pupils duly received their Upasampadā and only friendly and reverential terms with Malvatta would bring to the ācāryas higher offices in the community of monks of the sect. Thus learning and interest in the educational field had to be sacrificed in face of the sensitive attachments with Malvatta. As learning has developed concurrently with Buddhism in Ceylon, during

a problematic period of this nature the standards and interest in learning (will) automatically decline. In 1862, when Bentara Atthadassi died, the prosperous state of the Bentara educational institute was diminishing. Ratmalāna also became inactive in the last days of Valānē Siddhārtha. After Koggala Dhammatilaka became a layman and gave up robes, there were no pupils to continue the school of Mīripānnē.²² Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala, with the assistance of Malvatta, established another seat of learning at Bōgahagoḍālla temple and was climbing his way to success and fame as a great scholar of the Island just before the edition of the Buddhist Canon took place at Pālmaḍulla in 1867. (Out of the three famous pupils of Valānē Siddhattha we can indubitably say that only Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala carried on the tradition of teaching. Baṭuvantudāvē Devarakṣita, who disrobed while residing at Kolonnāva Raja Mahā Vihāraya, never gave up his interests in exploring knowledge. Hitherto unknown reasons forced Ratmalānē Dhammāloka to leave Purāna Vihāraya, Ratmalāna, and take residence at Baṁbaragala Vihāraya in Hatara²³ Kōralē. He lived there until 1854. Though we are not

22. I came across a few compositions of a poet named Sanghānanda bhikkhu of Mīripānnē Vihāraya, dated before 1845 at the British Museum. Unfortunately his name is not known in Ceylon among the writers of literary history. He never participated in the controversy in 1853-1854 and I believe he may have died before that.

23. K. Pragnākīrti, Śrī Dharmālōka Mahā Nāyaka Caritaya, (1937), pp. 7-9.

certain of the situation, I believe there arose a misunderstanding on the effect of pupillary succession at Ratmalāna which I will discuss in due course.

Up to this stage we have discussed the activities of the Siamese sect in the field of traditional knowledge. Serious students of literary history, I believe, must not ignore the service rendered by the bhikkhus of the Amarapura sect in this field. All the writers who have dealt with the literary history of this period have deliberately concealed the facts which concern the actual literary activities of the monks of the Amarapura sect. Caste feelings and attachment towards the Siamese sect influenced heavily in the distortion of real events. Here I will make attempts to gather existing materials on the activities of the monks of the Amarapura Nikāya for the development of traditional learning.

Though Vālitara Gñānavimalatissa mahānāyaka thera of Puṣpārāmaya, Vālitara, Balapitiya, the celebrated founder of the Amarapura sect, was ignored and disclaimed by the next generation of bhikkhus of the Siamese sect as a pupil of Vālivita Saranankara, from the available sources at Puṣpārāmaya we can link his religious as well as his scholarly pupillary succession with that of

Malvatta. Bōvala Dhammānanda of Petangahavatta temple, Galle, a pupil of Vālivīṭṭa Saranankara, admitted him into the Order of the Siamese sect and he was taken to Malvatte for his studies at the feet of the Sangharāja.²⁴ Evidence to this effect still exists at the Puṣpārāma library. At the end of some ola leaf manuscripts we find²⁵ the statement ' Gñānavimala tānaṭa liyavā dena ladī' written by Saranankara himself. After the formation of the Amarapura sect we may presume that he lost his identity in the religious pupillary succession of Vālivīṭṭa Saranankara and the Siamese sect. But his scholarly pupillary succession with Saranankara could not be altered even after the establishment of the Amarapura sect. His five year stay in Burma must have allowed him to become very proficient in the Pali language and on his return he brought rare books written in Pali on religion and language to Puṣpārāmaya.²⁶

Gñānavimalatissa who realised the importance of learning founded a seat of learning at his temple.

24. A. P. Buddhadatta, Samīpātītayehi Baudhācāryayō, (1950), p. 21.

25. 'Copied this book for Gñānavimala'.

26. This information regarding the Vālitara branch was kindly put at my disposal by Galveherē Amaragñāna nāyaka thera, the present adhipati of Puṣpārāmaya, and Mullapiṭṭiyē Rālahāmy.

He had to start from the very beginning and had to spend his time collecting books from various parts of the Island and copying them for the benefit of future students. The libraries still to be found at Puṣpārāmaya, Vālitara, though ignored by the scholars of the country, are silent witnesses to his career as an enthusiast for learning.

With their newly gained religious and caste spirit the leaders of the Amarapura sect became conscious of the future of the sect in the field of religion and they too imitated the same pattern of activities as the Siamese sect, in adding more temples and gathering Novices into the sect. Undoubtedly the areas where the Salāgama community was dominant fell into the hands of Puṣpārāmaya, later described by the followers as the 'chief of the temples' (nāyaka pansala). Āmbagahapiṭṭiyē Valavva of Sahabandu Mudliar was offered to Gñānavimalatissa nāyaka thera and was renamed as 'Ambarukkhārāmaya'.²⁷ During the period we discuss we note here the net of principal temples spread under the 'chief of the temples' at Vālitara. Mahākappina Mudalindārāmaya of Balapiṭṭiya, Śrī Vijayārāmaya of Ahungalla, Gangārāmaya of Mahagoḍa and Mahāmangala Samudrārāmaya of Randombē were added to the Vālitara branch of the Amarapura sect with a number of subordinate temples. This growth in

27. I am grateful to Ahungallē Vimalakittitissa nāyaka thera, the present adhipati of Ambarukkhārāmaya, Balapiṭṭiya, for this information.

number of temples and Novices gave them confidence in the field of religious activities.

Vālitara Vimalasāratissa nāyaka thera, a religious and a scholarly pupil of Gñānavimalatissa, after his studies came to Āmbagahapiṭṭiyē Pansala and started to impart knowledge among Novices and village boys at Ambarukkhārāmaya. After the death of Gñānavimalatissa thera, the 'nāyaka pansala' was neglected by the bhikkhus of the Amarapura sect and they developed Ambarukkhārāmaya as their headquarters. Puṣpārāmaya was left alone with a massive library, unfortunately without any scholar to handle it. When Ambarukkhārāmaya, with Vālitara Vimalasāratissa as its head, became famous as a seat of learning among the bhikkhus of the Southern province, more interest was exhibited by the leaders of the nikāya in collecting books for the newly founded library at Āmbagahapiṭṭiyē Valavva. When in 1875, at the instance of the British government, Louis De Zoysa inspected the temple libraries of the Island he mentioned the library at Āmbagahapiṭṭiya as an extensive one.²⁸ Most of the Novices of the Amarapura sect received their education at Āmbagahapiṭṭiya temple under the guidance of Vālitara Vimalasāratissa nāyaka thera. The bhikkhus of the sect believed that

28. Louis De Zoysa, Reports on the Inspection of Temple Libraries, (1875) p.11.

scholarship really lay in acquaintance with the Pali language, as they had close relations with Burma.

Vimalasāratissa is highly acclaimed for his talents in versification in Pali and his compilation 'Sāsana Vamsa Dīpa Mahā Kāvya', a history of the Buddhist church and the origin of the Amarapura sect written in 1879, with 1672 verses, is still acclaimed by the scholars of the sect.²⁹

The name of 'Ukkaṭṭha Mahātissa Ariyavamsadhaja Vālitara A.U.Śrī Gñānatilaka nāyaka thera' has to be mentioned here as the most valuable product of Ambarukkhārāmaya. He was proficient in Pali like his predecessors and undertook the task of continuing the educational activities at the seat of learning. He devoted much time to preparing paraphrases for Pali books and the printed and unprinted titles are evident of his clear vision in the field of teaching Pali to Sinhalese students. At the Am̐bagahapit̐iya library we can still read the Sinhalese verbal paraphrases of Ekakkhara Kosa, Mukhamatta Dīpanī, Kaccāyana Sāra, Gandhābharana, Vācakopadesa, Rūpa Bhedappakāsinī, Nirutti Bheda Sangaha, Pada Bhedaya and Dhātu Pāṭha Vilāsinī.

29. The poem was first printed by Baltasār Mendis Vīrasinha Vickramaratne, in 1880, and a ceremony was held at Ambarukkhārāmaya on 5.9.1966 in respect of this poem. The suppression of this work by the scholars of the Siamese sect is mentioned in the introduction to the fourth and fifth cantos of the mahākāvya in 1961 by Ratgama Paṇṇāsēkera.

All these are commentaries or verbal interpretations and explanations written in Sinhalese which would be of help for⁵ the students who wanted to be conversant with the Pali language and Buddhism. Most of the books mentioned here were compiled in Burma in connection with the Kaccāyana system of Pali grammar and there is evidence for the existence of commentaries composed in Burma for Mukhamattadīpanī,³⁰ Vāccavācaka,³¹ and Ganthābharana. Research work has still to be commenced by a Pali scholar, to examine the affinity between the Burmese commentaries and the Sinhalese commentaries. Gñānatilaka's unfinished great scholarly contribution, 'Nirutti Ratanākara' an original comprehensive grammar of the Pali language, consisting of 2550 stanzas, lies at Ambarukkhārāmaya awaiting the serious attention of a Pali scholar.

After the opening of Vidyodaya and Vidyāḷankāra pirivenas by Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala and Ratmalānē Dhammāloka, Valitara Gñānatilaka thera started a separate pirivena called 'Vijjobhāsa' in 1883 and their system in teaching Pali was continued by his disciple Baṇḍaramullē Amarasiha. When printing presses were available to him in the last decade of the century, Baṇḍaramullē printed the edited

30.A.P.Buddhadatta, Pāli Sāhitya, (1962) p.464.

31. ibid, pp. 488-489.

paraphrases written by his teacher which demonstrated the characteristics of the Vālitara system in teaching the Pali language. 'Śabda Binduva' (1888) and 'Kaccāyana Sāra' (1892) exhibit one characteristic which draws a line of separation between the systems of Vidyodaya and Vijjobhāsa Pirivena. All the productions of the disciples of Vidyodaya Pirivena for the development of Pali in Ceylon, such as 'Bālappabhodhana' of Vālivīṭṭiyē Dhammaratana (1887), Commentary on Pada Sādhana by Dhammānanda and Nānissara (1887) and Commentary on Sambandha Cintā by Kalutara Sārānanda (1891), were entirely in Pali, and those books were meant for those who were already conversant with that language, while all the titles printed by Vijjobhāsa Pirivena were in Sinhalese.

Kapugama Dhammakkhanda of Vālukārāmaya, Daḍalla, Galle, the founder of the branch of the Amarapura sect at Daḍalla, was a disciple of Valpola thera,³² whose teacher was Vālivīṭṭa Saranankara. The establishment of this branch must have been a setback to the development of the Vālitara branch. Dhammakkhanda and his pupils were of the same community, and the birth of the Daḍalla branch may have prevented the Vālitara branch from expanding to the more

32. Ratgama Sirisumana, Abhayatissa Nāyaka Caritaya, (1909) p.1.
 P.D.S. Virasuriya, Devundara Itihāsaya, (1962), p.181.
 Valpola thera had given up robes later and was named Valpola Guru.

remote villages in southern Ceylon. With the consent of the administrators of the Salāgama caste who patronised both groups, the bhikkhus of Vālitara (Kosgoḍa) and Daḍalla came to a compromise on their religious activities and apparently this peaceful agreement prevailed over half of a century. The abandonment of the sect by its founder and his conversion to Christianity³³ did not hinder its development. His dominant personality furnished Vālukārāmayā with an 'extensive library'³⁴ and a seat of learning. His educational and religious work was pursued by his capable pupil, Bōpāgoḍa Gñānālankāra Sirisumana therā, who succeeded his teacher as the mahānāyaka therā.³⁵ He was recognised as the scholarly and religious teacher of Lankāgoḍa Dhīrānanda of Kulīgōḍa Vihārāyā.³⁶ As a result of curiosity about the accurate adherence to the Vinaya rules by the bhikkhus of his sect, while receiving the higher ordination at the consecrated boundary in Mādu Gaṅga, Balapitīya, Lankāgoḍa raised doubts on the impurity of the Sīmā, which later paved the way for a prolonged

33. He became George Nadoris De Zilva, Mohoṭṭi Mudliar of the Mahabadda, native chief of the late Cinnamon department.

34. Louis De Zoysa, op.cit p.10.

35. Letter of Mirissē Dhammānanda of Aggārāmayā, Polvatta, Ambalangōḍa, on 14.10.1863.

36. Vinaya Vinicchaya of Lankāgoḍa Dhīrānanda, edited by Talallē Dhammarakkhita, introduction, unpaginated.

controversy among the monks of Amarapura sect. The controversy on the impurity of the boundary thus started in 1851, developed gradually to the stage of disintegration of the Amarapura sect into two chapters, namely Mūlavamsa Nikāya headed by the Vālitara bhikkhus and Saddhammavamsa Nikāya under the leadership of Lankāgoḍa Dhīrānanda. His critical exposition of the ecclesiastical rules was largely accepted even by the traditional scholars of Burma.³⁷

Saddhammavamsa Nikāya, under the leadership of Lankāgoḍa, developed rapidly among people with a great interest in intellectual affairs. During the time of Lankāgoḍa, Jayasēkarārāmaya in Demaṭagoḍa (1873), Sumanārāmaya in Kalamulla, and Vaskaḍuvē temple came under the administration of the Saddhammavamsa sect. Lankāgoḍa's reputation as a scholar who helped to develop the traditional learning was furthered by two scholars of the sect. Randombē Dhammāḷankāra of Mahā Mangala Samudrārāmaya³⁸ studied at the feet of Lankāgoḍa and after his studies he improved his temple to the status of a Raja Mahā Vihāraya with a large number of subordinate temples. Sēluttarārāmaya in Vihārēgoḍa, Sunandārāmaya

37. This letter of exposition is introduced as 'Gñeyyadhamma Sandēsa' by A.P. Buddhaddatta and is reproduced in his Pāli Sandesāvalī, (1962), pp. 137-151. Palm leaf copy of the letter is preserved at British Museum, OR 6605(5).

38. Earlier this temple belonged to the Vālitara branch.

in Paragahatoṭa, Tapōdhanārāmaya in Karandeniya, Siri Samantārāmaya in Vallambagala, Subhadrārāmaya in Ganēgoḍa, Jayasumanārāmaya in Amugoḍa, Rājārāmaya in Ratgama, Khettārāmaya in Kaṭukoliha, Vijaya Śrī Vardhanārāmaya in Vatugedara, Kosatumānānē temple and Kākirivatte temple in Kosgoḍa³⁹ were added to the Daḍalla branch at that time. But we hardly come across any literary activities which could be attributed to this scholar except the educational institutes he formed at the above mentioned temples and the participation in the Tripiṭaka edition in 1867. The other Pali scholar brought up by Lankāgoḍa was Vaskaḍuvē Śrī Subhūti mahānāyaka thera of Abhinavārāmaya, Vaskaḍuva. He belonged to the newly founded Saddhammavamsa sect and Lankāgoḍa Dhīrānanda was his Upādhyāya at the higher ordination ceremony. It has to be borne in mind that Subhūti was only a religious pupil of Lankāgoḍa Dhīrānanda. It is said that Vaskaḍuvē studied for seven years at Pālmaḍulla under the guidance of Induruvē Śrī Sumangala Medhankara. One possibly might doubt his studies at Pālmaḍulla, which was becoming insignificant as a seat of learning by that time when the Amarapura sect was endowed with famous seats of learning. But it appears

39. A.P. Buddhaddatta, op.cit p.122.

This list of temples is found in 'Daḍalu Sāsana Vamsaya' which is now with Vatugedara Amarasimha thera, the present Adhipati of Daḍalla temple, to whom I am grateful for information.

to be a fact, since Vaskaḍuvē mentions Sumangala as his⁴⁰ teacher. Buddhadatta nāyaka thera enlightens us on this point when he says the four brothers of Subhūti engaged in business at Ratnapura preferred to have their youngest brother with them studying at Pālmaḍulla.⁴¹

At a time when a printing press and a printed book were recognised as luxuries, in 1864, Vaskaḍuvē Subhūti was able to print the first printed Pali book in Ceylon in Sinhalese characters at the government press. It was Abhidhānappadīpikā, a glossary in the Pali language. His friendship with the Civil servants who came from England, gave him ample opportunities to print his books in the government press, when all the other scholars of the Siamese sect were fighting a great struggle to get printing presses for Buddhists. His original composition, 'Nāma Mālā', prepared at the suggestion of Professor R.C. Childers, was printed in 1876, at the government press. Since Bālāvatāra is widely used by the native scholars in imparting knowledge in Pali to students in Ceylon, Vaskaḍuvē Subhūti compiled the 'Nāma Mālā' for the purpose of facilitating the young student of Bālāvatāra in

40. Vaskaḍuvē Subhūti, Nāma Mālā, (1876), introduction, p.xcv.

(śabda śāstrāṭi dakṣa apācārya Sumangala Mēdhankara mahāsthavirādi Attaragama paramparāvē samahara guruvaru).

41. A.P. Buddhadatta, op.cit p.126.

acquiring knowledge ... which relates to Nouns'.⁴² He
 has consulted a large number of books in Pali and Sanskrit,⁴³
 some of which are now not known to modern students. His
 hundred page informative introduction written in Sinhalese
 is devoted to introducing books written on Pali grammar
 by various scholars. It was a great scholarly document
 — in the field of Pali.⁴⁴ It is clear that he was easily
 conversant with all those works which he described since
 he has cited quotations from all the original works. I
 believe the great knowledge shown by this scholar is
 incomparably above that of all other Ceylon scholars of
 the time in the Pali language. When he was discussing
 'Sudhīra Mukha Maṇḍanaya' of Attaragama Rājaguru Baṇḍāra,
 the first Pali tutor of the scholarly pupillary succession
 of Vāliiviṭṭa Saranankara, Subhūti revealed for the first
 time the close connection of this work with 'Samāsa Cakra',
 a Sanskrit work which could not be found in Ceylon,⁴⁵
 with the true spirit of a scholar neglecting his teacher's
 status among the traditional scholars. And another point
 which comes to light when reading the introduction is

42. Vaskaḍuvē Subhūti, op.cit p.14.

43. Ibid, p.xcvii.

44. Some of the books described by Subhūti, it seems, did not come into the hands of Professor G.P.Malalasekera or A.P.Buddhadatta mahānāyaka thera, the two scholars who wrote on the Pali literature of Ceylon in this century.

45. ~~Idem~~ Introduction, p.18, footnote.

' the criticisms of the envious who are incompetent to judge on the merits of such productions'.⁴⁶ It can not be far from the truth if we assume that these critics mentioned by Subhūti may be the scholars of the Siamese sect.

In 1893, the government press published Subhūti's third Pali treatise ' Abhidhānappadīpikā Sūci', an index for Abhidhānappadīpikā , a book which was secretly⁴⁷ studied by the bhikkhus of the Siamese sect. The correspondence exchanged between Vaskaḍuvē Subhūti and various Western scholars, including R.C.Childers, is still to be found at Abhinavārāmaya, Vaskaḍuva and Bōdhirukkhā-rāmaya, Vāllavatta. Apart from these works mentioned here, we come across reference to two other contributions, which he made to the development of Pali literature in Ceylon. ' Culla Rāja Paritta Mahā Rāja Paritta' and⁴⁸ 'Uttara Vihāra Mahāvamsa' are the two compositions to his credit, but unfortunately no manuscripts or printed versions of these texts are to be found in Ceylon. We have only the appeal the author made to the

46.Vaskaḍuvē Subhūti, op.cit p.16.

47.The present principal of Vidyodaya pirivena when was a pupil copied the printed book in an exercise book and this is still with him.

48.Vaṃsatthappakāsini, Commentary on the Mahāvamsa, edited by G.P.Malalasekera, Oxford University Press, 1935, introduction, pp.lxv-lxvii.

Colonial Secretary in regard to printing the latter.

Tuḍuvēvattē Paññāsīha, a religious and a scholarly pupil of Lankāgoḍa Dhīrānanda, founded Kumāra Vihāraya, Doḍandūva,⁴⁹ with an educational seat. His scholarship in Pali is exhibited in the correspondence with R.C. Childers preserved in the British Museum.⁵⁰

In the light of this evidence we can affirm the service rendered by the Daḍalla branch of the Amarapura sect in the development of traditional learning.

Kataluvē Gunaratanatissa nāyaka thera, the founder of the Kalyāṇivamsa sect of Amarapura, was admitted to the Order by Bōvala Dhammānanda of Petangahavatta temple, a pupil of Vālivīṭa Saranankara.⁵¹ When he seceded from the Siamese sect after establishing the new sect, his religious pupillary connection with that sect may have become lost. Kataluvē's caste affiliations were so strong that before long the sect spread throughout the low country. 'Kalyāṇivamsa Gunaratanatissa Sāsana Vamso',⁵²

49.W.F.Gunawardene, Guttīla Kāvya Varṇanā, (1916) Second edition, p. xxxiv.

50.OR 2260, letter dated 19.1.1870.

51.A.P.Buddhadatta, Samīpātītayehi Bauddhācāryayō, (1950), p.34.

52.This manuscript is still at Śailabimbārāmaya, Doḍandūva. I am grateful to Doḍandūvē Dharmasena thera of Kumāra Vihāraya for this and other information regarding the sect.

an unpublished manuscript, shows us that during his life, Kataluvē temple, Degalla temple in Doḍandūva, Purāna⁵³ Subhadrārāmaya in Ambalangoda, Vālukārāmaya in Alutgama, Vāllabaḍa temple in Kalutara,⁵⁴ and Subhōdhārāmaya in Karagampitiya were added to the list of mahā vihāras with a net work of subordinate temples around those main temples. Though he was living at the temple now known as Śailabimbārāmaya, Doḍandūva, we hardly find any information regarding the educational activities of the temple at that time.

Mirissē Dhammānanda, the next mahānāyaka of the Kalyāṇivamsa Nikāya, of Aggārāmaya, Polvatta, Ambalangoda, received his education from Valpola guru,⁵⁵ whose special teacher was Attaragama Rājaguru Bandāra. It is nothing to be surprised at when I place every scholar in the scholarly pupillary succession of Vālivīṭa Saranankara. Saranankara was the fountain of learning from where the lesser streams of education were started in nineteenth-century Ceylon. The sacred place for the receipt of higher ordination in the Kalyāṇivamsa sect was accepted as Doḍandūva and the headquarters or the

53. Now this temple is known as Rankot Vihāraya.

54. This is now known as Pulinatalārāmaya.

55. Earlier he was a Buddhist priest.

W.F. Gunavardene, op. cit p. xxxii

A.P. Buddhadatta, op. cit p. 78

Lak Rivi Kirana, 12.9.1876.

mūlasthānaya was Śailabimbārāmaya. During Dhammānanda's time Śailabimbārāmaya was springing up as an educational institute of the Kalyāṇivamsa sect under the advice of Uḍugalpitiyē Sumanatissa,⁵⁶ the future nāyaka of the sect. This educational institute developed massively during the time of Doḍandūvē Piyaṛatanatissa nāyaka thera, the pupil of Uḍugalpitiyē Siri Sumanatissa. He was most progressive, in the sense that he was able to realise the necessity of English education to the modern world when Christian educationists were roaming around. He not only taught at the temple to the Novices but founded Jīnalabdhi Viśōdhaka school at Doḍandūva, one of the registered schools of the Buddhists, eleven years before the arrival of Olcott and compiled 'Jina Dharma Vikāśinī' and Gñēyārtha Dīpanī' for the use of the Buddhist children. We are unable to find printed versions of these two books in Ceylon⁵⁷ but still the manuscripts are to be found in the temple library at Śailabimbārāmaya.

Alutgama Śīlakkhandha, famous Sanskrit scholar, is said to have received his education from a colleague who had been to India.⁵⁸ He succeeded his teacher at the

56. Uḍugalpitiya appears to be the old name of Doḍandūva, (Parevi Sandēśa, verse 84). But his name was written in most correspondence as Uḍugampitiya.

57. One printed copy of Gñēyārtha Dīpanī is to be found at the British Museum.

58. Doḍandūvē Dharmārāma, the Adhipati of Kumāra Vihārāya, believed that he learnt Sanskrit from Māvāllē Gunānanda through correspondence.

Dodandūva seat of learning and was the teacher of Dodandūvē Dharmasena, Telvattē Ariyavansa and Telvattē Amaravansa. His writings in manuscript form can still be read at the sister monastery, Kumāra Mahā Vihāraya.⁵⁹ One of his original Sanskrit compositions was the biography of Lord Buddha, a mahā kāvya entitled Buddha Carita.⁶⁰

Thus at the beginning of 1865, we can undoubtedly deduce that there secretly prevailed rival feelings among the traditional seats of learning of the Siamese sect and the Amarapura sect.⁶¹ Nevertheless without exhibiting clear signs of enmity they continued their educational work in the above mentioned places. Meanwhile an interesting appeal appeared in Lakminipahana,⁶² the Sinhalese newspaper at that time, which could be considered as an expression of a dream which would materialise into reality in another decade in the field of traditional learning. This appeal was signed by Don Velom Vickramatilaka Appuhāmy and Don Philip De Silva Āpā Appuhāmy, the famous astrologer and the compiler of 'Āpā Pancānga Lita',

59. In the foregoing discussion we saw Kumāra Vihāraya was founded by a bhikkhu of the Dadalla branch.

60. The Siamese sect entertained bitter feelings towards their Sanskrit knowledge and Dharmasena thera complains that Dehigaspē Paññāsāra of Vidyodaya Pirivena never mentioned Śīlakkhandha in his Ph.D. thesis on Sanskrit literature in Ceylon (1958).

61. Unfortunately the development of learning in the Rāmañña sect could not be traced due to the absence of information.

62. Lakminipahana, 14.12.1864.

the second almanac printed in Sinhalese⁶³ which is still carried on by his grandson.

'Studying Buddhism and Sinhalese language was favourably encouraged by the Sinhalese kings of the past. Since the extinction of the Sinhalese monarchy knowledge of Buddhism and the Sinhalese language has been in decay.' After such an expression of feelings from both the writers, they put their proposal to organise a seat of learning (śāstra śālāva) which would teach Buddhism, grammars of Pali, Sinhalese and Sanskrit, history, medicine, logic, astrology and arithmetic. The feeling among Buddhists for the necessity of a school of this nature is clearly demonstrated in this appeal. After this there occurred letters of approval by Don Johannis Pieris, the Notary of Alutgama, and D.S.D.Silva of Mahanuvara on 18.12.1864, who promised to subscribe five pounds each for the Fund and M.Paṇṇāsēkara of Paramānanda Vihāraya, Minuvangoḍa, Galle, who contacted Amarasēkara Vijēratna Ubhayasēkara of Aṭṭadahevatta, Kataluva and reported the consent of Ubhayasēkara to offer ten pounds on 18.1.1865.

63. As in any other field of this period, the field of astrology also is subjected to a distortion of facts. Valimuni Arnōlis Mendis Abhayasēkara, popularly known as Ahungallē gurutumā, for the first time printed an almanac in 1855. Under the fanatical feelings of caste, all the writers of the Govigama caste and the followers of the Siamese sect discredited Ahungallē gurunnānsē and were blindly followed by others. They were reluctant to accept the first almanac as the compilation of Ahungallē but proclaimed it as a work of Āpā Appuhāmy who consented to print it under the name of a famous astrologer of that time. But the reasons which caused his acceptance as the greater astrologer are concealed by these writers.

On 1.2.1865, Don Velom Vickramatilaka Appuhāmy and Don Philip De Silva Āpā Appuhāmy, the two organisers, jointly thanked their wellwishers and certainly acknowledged the fulfilment of their expectations. Āpā Appuhāmy who became a close associate of Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala (in the) later (stages), after realising the weakness of the existing seats of learning in the Siamese sect, may have thought of providing Sumangala, the greatly respected scholar of the Siamese sect, a suitable place to impart his knowledge. Though the organisers predicted that their scheme would be adopted, nothing happened after that and we do not come across any further report about it in Lakminipahana. But some suggestions which they made in this appeal, it seems, definitely influenced the minds of Vidyādhāra Sabhāva, which started Vidyodaya Pirivena in the next decade, with Āpā Appuhāmy as one of its members.

The hopes of a traditional seat of learning which would suit (the) modern necessities were thus postponed, but the interest in learning and scholarship became irresistible in 1865. The most important religious and literary activity inspired by the recently revived traditional learning and scholarship of the Island was the edition of the Canon at Pālmaḍulla Purāna Vihāraya in the year 1867. This came about as follows.

During the time of Gāllē Medhankara, he had suggested the lay devotees should erect a larger house for the images in the Pālmaḍulla temple premises. Dolosvala Adikāram, the chief devotee of the temple, willingly finished the house for the images after the death of Medhankara. The family of Dolosvala Adikāram wished to be the chief family of lay devotees (pradhāna dāyaka pavula) of the temple and Vārigama Nilamē, the brother-in-law of the Adikāram, prosposed to have a new preaching hall in accordance with the newly built image house. During the life time he could not bring it about, but Iddamalgoḍa Abhayakōṇ Atapattu Mudiyansē Rālahāmy, the Basnāyaka Nilamē of Mahā Saman Dēvāle, Sabaragamuva, the son-in-law of the late Nilamē, fulfilled the wishes of his family.

After the creation of this Sudarśana Dharma Śālāva, under the guidance of Iddamalgoḍa Basnāyaka Nilamē with the assistance of a one hundred and forty member committee, weekly sermons were arranged and annually a great religious festival was organised. This committee consisting of village Buddhists managed the new preaching hall which had been erected at a cost of four thousand pounds, invited the preachers weekly and advertised the sermons, and this system was continued over a decade without any significant change.

Once Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala, the recognised scholar of Tilakārāmaya and Bōgahagoḍālla Sudarśana Paramānanda Vihāraya, was invited to give the religious discourse, in which he stressed the importance of learning Buddhism, but lamented over the standards of religious texts available to the Buddhist readers. The devotees pleaded with him to name the most appropriate meritorious work at that time, and Sumangala, who had prepared religious tracts in Galle against the writings of the Christians, promptly proposed an organised edition of Tripiṭaka. After the sermon Iddamalgoḍa, with the advice of Sumangala, decided to build a house of residence (sanghāvāsa) for bhikkhus who would participate in the edition of the Buddhist Canon, at Pālmaḍulla. With the generous assistance of the other chiefs of Sabaragamuva and Ūva provinces and of the villagers Iddamalgoḍa completed the new sanghāvāsa which opened in 1861.⁶⁴ In the month of June, 1865, at the end of a religious festival the donors offered the residence to the bhikkhus of the four quarters. Iddamalgoḍa with the assent of the chiefs sent letters of invitation to the recognised scholarly monks and lay pandits of the country for participation in the editorial work. But the response was weak, and he subsequently made a common appeal

64. Lakminipahana, 1.11.1861.

to all the Buddhists, high priests and scholars of the Island. 'Due to the absence of a critical edition of the Canon by eminent scholars it is regrettable to note the texts that we found in the libraries are full of irrelevances, misinterpretations, inaccuracies, lack of punctuation marks and obscurities in the language. After a collation of ten or twelve copies of the same text and a comparison of its commentaries the scholars of the Island are in a position to decide the correct and original versions of the text'.⁶⁵

Furthermore he added that all the scholars who arrive at Pālmaḍulla will be aptly fed, reverently accommodated and even be paid their travelling expenses. The services of elderly and indisposed monks who are unable to attend were invited in supplying rare texts of the scriptures, not only from their own libraries but also from libraries

65. 'Tripitaka paryāpti dharmaya liyana lada pot ek stānayaḍaḍi dharmavinayadhara paṇḍitayan lavā śuddha koṭa liyā tābīmaka nokaravana lada bāvin ... ē ē tanhi lipikaruvaṇ lavā liyavā avyakta janayin visin varada balā tānin stāna pavatvannā vū pot sithila dhanitāḍi vyanjana vaśayenda ... virāmaśthānāḍiyehi sanghā rēkhā tābīm vaśayenda sama novanu pamanaka nova ē ē piṭapatvala paḍōnatā, pada vipatti, pāṭhōnatāḍiyen yuktava tibena bava dākīma Buddhāgama dat vyakta bahusṛta śramaṇayin vahansēlāṭada grhaśtha paṇḍitayainṭada atiśayin citta santāpa upadavannā vū hētuveka. ekama saṅgiyaka hō prakaraṇayaka hō piṭapat dahayaka dolahaka eka tānhi dī bālīmen nivarada pāṭha meśeyayi aṭuvāṭikāḍiyē upakāra lāba niścaya karaṇṭa pososata vū gihi pavidi paṇḍitavarayinda dān lankāvē vājambena heyinda ...'

in Siam and Burma. This unique appeal to the Buddhists was signed by Iddamalgoḍa Basnāyaka Nilamē with the consent of five other chiefs of Ūva and Sabaragamuva, namely Eknāligoḍa Mahīpāla Akkrappu Vickramasinha raṭē mahattayā, the administrator of Kuruviṭa Kōralē, Eknāligoḍa Mahīpāla Akkrappu Vickramasinha Mudiyaṇsē Rālahāmy, Basnāyaka Nilamē of Saman Dēvāle, Boltuṃbē, Mahavalatānnē Vickramasinha Candrasēkara Seneviratna raṭē mahattayā of Kaḍavata Māda Kōralē, Vārigama Abhayasirivardhana Alahakōṇ, Basnāyaka Nilamē of Kataragama Dēvāle, Alutnuvara, and Uḍuvāhara Abhayakōṇ Jayasundara Herat Bandāra Mudiyaṇsē Rālahāmy. These administrators of Sabaragamuva and Ūva provinces it seems had not discarded their traditional religion in pursuit of (their) office(s) unlike their counterparts in the low-country, and through their administrative power they were able to gather many villagers into religious activities.

The literature which we have found in regard to the conduct of the Synod supplies us with various versions of the event. The biography of Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala, written fifty years after the events, gives us a list of names of the participants. According to Yagirala Paṇṇānanda, the biographer, Valānē Siddhattha, Uḍugampola Ratanapāla, Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala, Yātrāmullē Dharmārāma and Baṭuvantudāvē Pandit represented the Siamese sect, while Lankāgoḍa

Dhīrānanda, Randoṃbē Śrī Dhammāṅkārā, Vāligama Siri Sumangala, Doḍandūvē Piyaṛatanatissa and Vaskaḍuvē Subhūti appeared on behalf of the Amarapura sect. It has to be borne in mind that this anecdote, in its glorification of Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala, resorts to exaggeration and sometimes omitt(ed) facts which (would) detract from his greatness. The author gives us the information of an illness of Valānē Siddhattha which prevented him from taking part in the activities, but mentions an unanimous agreement to read the final version of the text in front of him for his approval. A decision of this nature may have been accepted by the bhikkhus of the Siamese sect without considering whether they belong to Kālāṇiya or Malvatta, since they were all scholarly pupils of Valānē Siddhattha, but its approval by the scholars of the Amarapura sect is incredible, as they had no reverence for his knowledge for one thing and they belonged to a separate school of learning for another.

'The bhikkhus were invited to the main hall and initially they were given copies of the Vinaya Piṭaka with its commentaries. The bhikkhus who compared the text with the copies from Burma and Siam had to correct the pages individually in their rooms. They met at an arranged hour and after long and informative discussions

the whole committee unanimously agreed on the final version of the text which they handed over to Valānē. Seven months ⁶⁶ were spent to revise the five books of the Vinaya Piṭaka with its commentary and the accepted texts were handed down to able copyists who were selected after a careful examination'. ⁶⁷

This report consists of inaccuracies, as it is meant to extol the leaders of the Siamese sect. The submission to Valānē for approval could not be substantiated by the author of this report. A handwritten contemporary document of Mullēriyāvē Gunaratana, a colleague of Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala and one who took part actively in the edition of Vinaya Piṭaka, which is now in the possession of Kalukoṇḍayāvē Nāyaka thera, illustrates the real situation of the Synod. It was the agreement signed by all the participants after the edition of Vinaya Piṭaka. Though the edition of Vinaya Piṭaka was completed in five months, the edition of Sūtra Piṭaka could not be completed even after nine years. Disturbed at the delay in editing the books of Sūtra Piṭaka, all the members, who had edited Vinaya Piṭaka with the assistance of Iddamalgoḍa Nilamē, prepared a compendium of rules and regulations for those who wished to read and transcribe

66. As a matter of fact it seems to have been only five months.

67. Y. Paññānanda, Śrī Sumangala Caritaya, (1947), Vol. 1, pp. 172-175.

the texts, drawn up on 7.6.1874. This document gives the name of Molamurē Rājapakṣa Disānāyaka, raṭē mahattayā of Vēhāllaka, as a chief who had helped the venture at the beginning, apart from those mentioned in the appeal to the Buddhists which appeared in Lakminipahana. The procedure mentioned in this document is extremely different from the report in the biography of Sumangala and is curiously established by the statements which we come across in the personal correspondence of Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala.

'The priests who gathered at the Sudarśana Dharma Śālāva, in Pālmaḍulla of Uḍa Pattuva in Navadun Kōralē of the Sabaragamuva province, have decided the books to be divided among them as follows;

First Book- Pārājikā Pāli:- Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala, Puvakdandāvē

Sumangala, Baṭuvantuḍāvē Pandit.

Second Book-Pācittiya Pāli :- Lankāgoḍa Dhīrānanda, Vālitara

Dhammālakāra, Vaskaḍuvē Śrī

Subhūti, Kōdāgoḍa Paññāsēkara.

Third Book- Mahāvagga :- Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala,

Mullēriyāvē Gunaratana.

Fourth Book-Cullavagga :- Vāligama Sumangala,

Doḍandūvē Piyyaratana.

Fifth Book-Parivāra Pāṭha:- Valānē Siddhattha and his pupils.

Samanta Pāsādikā-commentary:- Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala.'

This division is clearly proved by the letter written to Aruggamuvē thera, the teacher of Sumangala, by Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala himself on 10.8.1867, in which he says that 'we of the Siamese sect received three books while the bhikkhus of Amarapura sect were in receipt of two books, to be edited. As Puvakdandāvē thera was indisposed I myself with Baṭuvantuḍāvē are progressing in the edition of the book'.⁶⁸

After irksome work of five months these scholars finished the texts assigned to them and the final meeting was held at Sudarśana hall, at which nearly sixty bhikkhus from both the sects were present. Ten bhikkhus from each sect were selected as the final arbiters of the text and they had to decide the final authoritative version of the texts after critical discussions. Only a few names of these arbiters are mentioned in this document. Valānē Siddhattha, Puvakdandāvē Sumangala, the chief incumbent of Pālmaḍulla Purāna Vihāraya, Mullēriyāvē Gunaratana, Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala from the Siamese sect and Lankāgoḍa Dhīrānanda, Bulatgama Sirisumanatissa, Doḍandūvē Piyaṛatanatissa, Vāligama Sumangala, Vālitara Dhammāḷankāra, Vaskaḍuvē Subhūti and Kōḍāgoḍa Paññāsekara⁶⁹ from the Amarapura sect were elected respectively as prerogative judges of the text. Though

68.Y.Paññānanda, op.cit,p.176.

69.Though there are no books available to his credit his scholarly interest in learning can be seen in his correspondence with Hugh Nevill.

the date of this final meeting was not mentioned, we certainly can fix it before 15.2.1868. Valānē nāyaka thera, who took part in this meeting, after hearing the news of a serious ailment of one of his disciples at Ratmalāna returned and died there on that day.⁷⁰ There were rumours about the death of Valānē. People believed that his opponents had poisoned him at Pālmaḍulla or had performed a magical charm (koḍivina) on him.

Sūtra Piṭaka was also distributed following the same principles, but work was still being carried on by those scholars at their village temples even in 1874. This retirement of the bhikkhus to the temples prevented the appearance of a final edition of the Sūtra Piṭaka or Abhidhamma Piṭaka. It remained a half finished project during this period, and though three attempts were made after this to edit the Canon in the Island they had hardly any connection with that of Pālmaḍulla.⁷¹

There appears another report of the Synod which gives rather a truer version with some incorrect statements. Thus reported the Indian Antiquary;

70.Y.Paññānanda, op.cit, pp.179-180.

71. Most of the information regarding the edition at Pālmaḍulla is taken from two contemporary reports written by Hāldaṇḍuvana Sri Dhammarakkhita, and Mullēriyāvē Gunaratana. I am grateful to Kalukōṇḍayāvē nāyaka thera for allowing me to read these documents.

"The Synod was under the joint presidency of two eminent prelates, Sumairgala(sic) and Dhirananda, and its members were priests selected for their learning and scholarship, from the principal Ceylon monasteries. The procedure was as follows:- After the formal opening of the Synod, each member was furnished with a manuscript in the Sinhalese character, which he took to an apartment assigned to him, and collated with a number of Ceylon, Burma and Siam copies of the same work. All obvious errors in his manuscript he corrected at once, but where a passage was doubtful, he merely marked it. On an appointed day each member carried his corrected manuscript to the hall of assembly, where in a public sitting of the Synod all the corrected manuscripts were compared together. When the corrections were identical in all the manuscripts, they were generally adopted without much loss of time, but in many doubtful or difficult passages the reading was not finally fixed without long and anxious discussion. The first session of the Synod lasted seven months, and was devoted exclusively to the Vinaya, a revised and authorised version of which, together with its Arthakatha and Tikas, was deposited in safe hands. The next meeting was held after a considerable interval, and was devoted to the correction of Sutra Pitaka. On this occasion a somewhat different plan was followed, for the members had been instructed to correct at their own monasteries the manuscripts entrusted to them, and when the Synod met, it was able to sit daily until the work of fixing the text of the Sutras was ended. The Abhidhamma Pitaka is now undergoing revision, and the labours of the Synod are drawing to a close. When they are completed, a palmleaf copy of the authorized version of the Sacred texts will be deposited in one of the Ceylon monasteries, and the public will be permitted to inspect and transcribe the different books"72

The various social forces which emerged in Sinhalese society, as we have mentioned in the last chapter, did not allow the edition to be completed. But the arrangements made in connection with the edited books which were to be kept at a special library in Sudarśana hall, greatly influenced the minds of the Buddhists. The religious festivals

72. The Indian Antiquary, edited by Jas Burgess, Vol. 1, Part 1, (5.1.1872), Bombay, pp. 31-32.

organised by the Buddhists of the Island tend to recognise and revere the importance of being a scholar (who is) conversant with traditional learning. An edited 'great book' (poṭa vāhaṇsē) was taken in a procession, with due respect, to the village temple of the assigned editor. Here I will show how 'Samanta Pāsādikā', the book edited by Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala, was carried to Galle from Pālmaḍulla after the first sitting, in order to give an impression of its influence.

From Ratnapura, the adjoining town of Pālmaḍulla, along Kalugaṅga the book was brought in a boat to Kalutara. Sumangala left Kalutara on 27.5.1868, reached Ambalangoḍa on 29.5.1868 and arrived at Hikkaḍuva on 30.5.1868. This procession reached Galle on 5.6.1868 after a stay at Doḍandūva. From Kalutara to Galle the distance is fortyfive miles along the highway, and the procession took ten days to reach its destination. Thus it was a lengthy process, during which all the Buddhists living by the side of the highroad witnessed not only the labours of a scholar, but the recognition and reverence offered to the scholar himself in recognition of his learning. The processions were organised by the villagers on the instructions of the chief incumbent of their temple, and to organise a grand procession creates an attitude of competition among the villagers. This procedure must have influenced the minds

of the Buddhists in realising the importance of a scholar.

The loss of Valānē Siddhattha, before the completion of the first programme of the edition, affected the traditional learning of the Siamese sect. After the^{his} death, an interesting event occurred at the Purāna Vihāraya, Ratmalāna, which will puzzle the mind of a religious student. Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala was invited to continue the educational institute at the temple by the devotees.

Now at the time of Valānē's death Ratmalānē Dhammāloka, the hereditary owner of the temple, was living at the Purāna Vihāraya. He had been excluded from the scholarly gathering at Pālmaḍulla. Ratmalānē's life is (an entity) full of unanswerable questions such as why he left the temple and the educational institute at Ratmalāna, his heritage in accordance with the pupillary succession: why he did not receive higher ordination until he reached his thirty second year: why he reacted against the accepted rule among the bhikkhus regarding a pupil, by accepting Dharmārāma as a disciple without waiting five years, in 1864; ⁷³ and most of all why he was not invited to the edition of the Tripitaka by Sumangala, his colleague at Ratmalāna or by Valānē, his teacher.

73. Dharmārāma entered the Order in May 1864. (Śrī Dharmārāma Caritaya, p. 15). According to the accepted practice Dharmāloka would be entitled to have a pupil in 1865, five years after his Upasampadā.

If his studies are considered, Dhammāloka was the pupil who spent the longest period at the feet of Valānē Siddhattha rather than Baṭuvantudāvē or Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala. Baṭuvantudāvē came there for studies after his higher ordination in 1840,⁷⁴ and he had left Ratmalāna by 1844, as we have evidence of his staying at Kolonnāva Raja Mahā Vihāraya, learning the Nagari script from a Catholic priest in that year. Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala came to Ratmalāna for studies in 1844 and left the school in 1848.⁷⁵ Now Ratmalānē Dhammāloka was ordained an year before the arrival of Valānē Siddhattha at Ratmalāna. Valānē was invited by the teacher of Ratmalānē Dhammāloka and the lay devotees, and it is believed that Dhammāloka was then brought to that temple in 1838 by his religious teacher who was interested to see his pupil become a scholarly pupil of Valānē.⁷⁶ Before Valānē came to Ratmalāna, Dhammāloka had been studying at Kōṭṭē Raja Mahā Vihāraya. Thus with the arrival of Valānē at Ratmalāna, Dhammāloka became the first scholarly pupil of Valānē Siddhattha at Ratmalāna. In the light of this evidence we can

74.A.P.Buddhadatta, *Samīpātīṭayē Baudhācāryayō*, p.177.

75.Y.Paññānanda, *op.cit*, p.46.

76.*idem*, pp.88-89.

argue that Dhammāloka was a student of Valānē from 1838 and he continued to be so until 1847. During his nine year period of study at the feet of Valānē it is said that there arose many obstacles to his learning, since Valānē was going to other temples to observe Vas.⁷⁷ After a consideration of these facts we may well wonder why Dhammāloka was not invited to edit the Tripiṭaka at Pālmaḍulla.

In 1868 after the death of Valānē Siddhattha, Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala was invited to the Ratmalāna educational institute by the lay devotees of the temple to assume duties as the principal of the institute. This was the interesting event which I have mentioned earlier. If the religious pupillary succession is to be counted, Sumangala was an outsider to the heritage of Ratmalāna Purāna Vihāraya and the seat of learning, while Dhammāloka had every right to his claims. His religious pupillary succession will aptly show his ownership to the temple and to the educational institute at Ratmalāna. It is as follows;

77. Koṭahēnē Pragnākīrti, Śrī Dharmālōka Caritaya, (1937), p.6.

ācārya paramparāva when entering the Order:

Vālivīṭṭa Saranankara Sangharāja



Āsideniyē sāmī



Talangama Sobhita



Maraluvavē Sobhita



Añḍupē Sonuttara



Ratmalānē Dhammāloka.⁷⁸

Even though Dhammāloka was not invited by other scholars of the Island to participate in the edition of Tripitaka, perhaps because of inefficiency or inability at the time in such scholarly work, after the death of Valānē Siddhattha he became responsible for pursuing the educational activities at his hereditary temple.

How the appointment of Sumangala could happen is not clear. How could Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala, who had acted against his teacher Valānē's view in the formation of Kālani branch of the Siamese sect and who supported Malvatta against the wishes of Valānē,⁷⁹ assume duties as the principal of the seat of learning at Ratmalāna? Here we can only note the misunderstanding and the complications which occurred in the religious and scholarly pupillary succession.

78. Satya Samuccaya, edited by Ratmalānē Dharmārāma, (30.11.1890), unpaginated.

See also Kumara Sandēśaya, (1909) verses 289-293.

79. I have discussed this in the first chapter.

Valānē Siddhattha had resided at Ratmalāna Vihāraya for thirty years after being invited there in 1838, though he had no claim to the temple. As far as the activities of the temple are concerned, the Buddhists must have realised that the more important part was played by Valānē and not by Sonuttara the chief incumbent of the temple. Ratmalāna became famous not because of the temple but due to the existence of a seat of learning. Valānē not only taught the children of the lay devotees, but was of great assistance to them in reading their horoscopes and in other astrological affairs. His handsome figure is still a popular legend among the Buddhists. These events may have put Añdupē Sonuttara, the teacher and the hereditary owner of the temple, in an insignificant nominal position as against the popularity of Valānē Siddhattha as a scholar. At a critical juncture like this the devotees would naturally take the side of the popular leader though he had no legal claims, and neglected the complications of the religious pupillary succession. After his studies Dhammāloka may have realised that he was losing his grip at Ratmalāna. Was this the cause for his seclusion at Baṃbaragala temple, which he legally owned as a result of his religious pupillary succession? After realising the power of the lay devotees and that Valānē is much stronger than his own legal claims to the temple and to the seat of learning, does Sonuttara

send his pupil, Dhammāloka, to safeguard the temple at Baṃbaragala in Hatara Kōralē, while he is losing at Ratmalāna?

If this could be assumed, naturally there would be grounds for an enmity between Dhammāloka and Siddhattha, irrespective of their teacher-student relationship. Was this the reason for the exclusion of Dhammāloka from the editorial work at Pālmaḍulla? Was this rivalry which created suspicions on the death of Valānē? ⁸⁰ Did the popular support accorded to Valānē by the lay Buddhists create an interest in him for the premises, leading him to ignore his host's claim? This could be the only reason for a suggestion by the lay devotees to Sumangala to act as the principal of the institute. Although the foregoing discussion may look imaginative, I assume that unless similar events did occur at Ratmalāna, Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala could not have been invited to Ratmalāna Purāna Vihāraya, since this would clearly have been against the wishes of Aṇḍupē Sonuttara and his pupil Ratmalānē Dhammāloka.

Though the security of tenure was doubtful at the educational institute, at the invitation of the lay devotees Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala came to Ratmalāna and engaged in teaching 'twenty students Pali, Sanskrit and the Holy

80. There were even rumours of poison.

scriptures of our Lord Buddha'.⁸¹ Meanwhile the Buddhist devotees of Pahala Pansala, Koṭahēna, invited Sumangala to observe the rainy season in 1870 at their temple. As Migeṭṭuvattē Gunānanda, the religious leader who supported him during the religious struggle against the Christians, was living there, Sumangala favourably accepted the invitation. It is said that Sumangala arrived at the temple with four higher-ordained bhikkhus and four novices⁸² who may have been studying at Ratmalāna under him. The unity of Sumangala and Gunānanda did not have any effect on the forgotten religious 'war' with the Christians. Since the participation in the edition of Tripiṭaka, all the scholars had lost interest in affairs of that nature as we have discussed in the preceeding chapter.

The bhikkhus who heard of the observance of Vas at Koṭahēna by Sumangala brought their disciples there for studies. Ilukvattē Medhankara was one of them, and has left us a valuable record of Sumangala's educational activities at Koṭahēna and Māligākanda. The appointment of Sumangala to the highpriesthood of Adam's Peak was challenged by Galagama Atthadassi, the former nāyaka thera,

81. A letter of Sumangala to E.R. Gunaratna, written on 2.8. 1869, reproduced in Y. Paññānanda, op. cit, p. 185.

82. *ibid*, p. 185.

and there was a prolonged lawsuit against Sumangala. When he had to attend ^{to} the case, Sumangala entrusted his pupils to Baṭuvantudāvē to be taught.⁸³ After his victory it is described in his biography that he determined to stay in Colombo and was searching for a suitable place where he could build up a seat of learning. At this point the suppositions I raised earlier on Dhammāloka and his heritage at Ratmalāna should be discussed in the light of these events. This bitter and embarrassing law procedure on his appointment at Śrī Pāda must have disturbed his conscience and may have created a doubt on his position at Ratmalāna. He had no chance for claims at Ratmalāna in comparison with Śrī Pāda. In case of Śrī Pāda he was appointed by the Sangha Sabhā with the consent of the respective administrators of the sacred place, after displacing Galagama Atthadassi. So Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala was duly and ~~legally~~ legally elected and appointed, to Adam's Peak. But things were quite different at Ratmalāna, since there was a legally and customarily accepted heir to the place. Considering the aftereffects of the legal appointment, Sumangala may have entertained second thoughts on his illegal

83. U. Suvannajoti, Ilukvattē Mēdhankara Caritaya, (1889), pp. 3-4.

appointment at Ratmalāna.⁸⁴ Otherwise no sensible person would go in search of new premises for a seat of learning, when there was a famous seat of learning at hand which had flourished for over three decades. One would only have to reorganise the existing establishment according to his taste and talents when it came under his management. As it was, the teaching procedure and the educational activities at Ratmalāna must have collapsed due to the absence of Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala and we have no evidence in regard to the existence of the Ratmalāna seat of learning after 1870.

While teaching at Koṭahēna, Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala convened a meeting to discuss the necessity of having a seat of learning in Colombo. With the assistance of thirteen members he formed 'Vidyādhāra Sabhā' in 1873. The main intention of the Sabhā was to establish a Pirivena or traditional seat of learning mainly for the bhikkhus but also for laymen, to teach Buddhism and affiliated literatures. They decided to collect six thousand pounds

84. The legal complications regarding this case are pinpointed by George William Woodhouse, in his dissertation submitted to the University of Cambridge, on 'Sissiyānu Sissia Paramparawa and Other Laws Relating to Buddhist Priests in Ceylon'. In respect to this case it seems that the chief Justice said 'though we hold that the Crown has given up its power of appointment to this Highpriesthood, it by no means follows that we are to hold that the Crown has given up the power of removal'. (1916), Tellippallai, p.8.

from the Buddhist public to buy an appropriate site for buildings. Promising to raise the amount the thirteen members of the Fund signed an agreement on 6.12.1873.⁸⁵ The unchallenged popular acceptance of the year 1873 as the opening year of Vidyodaya Pirivena becomes invalid and doubtful in the light of this evidence. There is no total agreement on the month, some preferring July to the more popular conjecture, December.⁸⁶ The opinion favouring the month of July could be disregarded since we read of advertisements which call for public help for the Fund of Vidyādhāra Sabhā in the month of December.

85. The thirteen members who signed the agreement are as follows;

Don Philip De Silva Āpā Appuhāmy
 Lansagē Andiris Perera Appuhāmy
 Kalansūriya Āraccigē Don Kornēlis De Silva Appuhāmy
 Gurunnānsēlāgē Don Pālis Appuhāmy
 Bulatsinhalagē Kornēlis Kurē Appuhāmy
 Don Tomas Virakkoḍi Appuhāmy
 Villora Āraccigē Kornēlis Perera Appuhāmy
 Paṭṭiyavattagē Hendrick Perera Appuhāmy
 Simon Silva Appuhāmy
 Hēvāvitāranagē Don Karōlis Appuhāmy
 Vettasinthagē Don Kornēlis Silva Appuhāmy
 Lansagē Simon Perera Appuhāmy
 Samarasinha Āraccigē Don Harmānis Appuhāmy.
 This agreement is reproduced in Y. Paññānanda, op.cit, pp. 189-193.

86. It is curious to read the writings of the members of Vidyodaya Pirivena who undoubtedly were aware of the names of the pupils and exact number present on the first day, but forgot the exact date of the opening. But I think the members of the nineteen thirties certainly did not know of the exact date. The now existing Śrī Sumangala Dharma Śālāva was built to commemorate the 50th year of the opening of the Pirivena, and the opening of this hall took place on 17.11.1926. (Vidyodaya, edited by C.A. Hevavitarana, Vol. 1, No. 11-12, p. 437. *date*)

After their first meeting, the thirteen governors of the Fund made arrangements to collect the money from all the Buddhists of the Island. Lansagē Andiris Perera, father of Dharmapala Hevavitarana's mother, had land at Māligākanda. As Andiris Perera was one of the governors of the Fund the other members of the Vidyādhāra Sabhā felt that his land was the most suitable site for buildings. Even if we attribute only six months for the preparation of temporary buildings, the opening of Vidyodaya Pirivena can only be in 1874 and not in 1873 as Sinhalese writers tend to believe. The promise to collect six thousand pounds to buy the land could not be kept by the Sabhā and only two thousand and seventy pounds were collected as subscriptions from the Buddhists of the Island. Eventually Andiris Perera offered the land free to Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala and his future successors, on 31.3.1876.⁸⁷

There are no available reports about the opening of Vidyodaya Pirivena, though we are certain that it can not be fixed on any date in 1873. After the erection of buildings in the new site at Māligākanda, what Sumangala must have done was to continue his teaching to the students who had been with him at Koṭahēna at new premises in new halls, under a new title in 1874. Therefore the opening

87. Y. Paṇṇānanda, op.cit, pp.194-200.

of Vidyodaya Pirivena at Māligākanda most probably would have taken place by the rainy season of 1874.

As we have discussed, the year 1873 exhibits the awakening signs of the rivalry between Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala and Ratmalānē Dhammāloka. After his displacement at Ratmalāna, Dhammāloka with his disciple was searching for temples which would gather him more power. Dhammāloka may have cleared up the misunderstanding and the complications which arose at Ratmalāna on his position when Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala deserted the place, but with his pupil Kalapaluvāvē Dhammārāma, he was seeking an arena to meet Sumangala in the future. Sumangala's activities never passed unnoticed by Dhammāloka. After he gained position at Raja Mahā Vihāraya, Ratmalāna, Dhammāloka wanted to develop that temple with its subordinate temples. Their rivalry first comes to the notice of (the) religious and literary students in 1873. When Sumangala published a Journal 'Samaya Sangrahava' in January 1873, as a competitive journal there appeared Dhammāloka's 'Satya Samuccaya' in July 1873. At the end of 1873 Dhammāloka and Dhammārāma resided at Dhammapāsāda in Demaṭagoḍa, which they had added to their possession in recent times. Both (of the) bhikkhus were invited by the devotees of Petiyagoḍa to observe the rainy season in 1874. This invitation was accorded in agreement with Māpiṭigama Sangharakkhita and

Māpitigama Dhammarakkhita, the adhipati and his religious pupil at Kālani Raja Mahā Vihāraya.⁸⁸

While living at a temporary building near the 'pandal',⁸⁹ 'where there were only two beds and a few benches made out of planks'⁹⁰ Dhammāloka and Dharmārāma started a school for the benefit of village children. As Dhammāloka was the patron of the Dhammaparāyana Society at Pāliyagoḍa formed the previous year he had a good response in the village. During the week end they went to Ratmalāna, which was now safely under their management. The competition between Dhammāloka and Sumangala materialised in the opening of another seat of learning at Pāliyagoḍa in 1875. On 1.11.1875 Ratmalānē Dhammāloka and Kalapaluvāvē Dharmārāma founded Vidyālankāra Śāstra Śālāva, at Pāliyagoḍa.

Both seats of learning, Vidyodaya Pirivena and Vidyālankāra Śāstra Śālāva, admitted pupils for their studies irrespective of their castes and sects. From 1875 onwards these two institutions were competing with each other in developing separate traditions in learning. From the available facts here I will make an attempt to assess the standards of learning and scholarship which these two founders were trying to uphold.

88.P.Rāmacandra, Śrī Dharmārāma mahānāyaka Caritaya, (1913), p.24.

89.This place is now known as Torana Handiya along the Kandy-Colombo Road.

90.Prabhāṣodaya, edited by

The main intention in establishing Vidyodaya Pirivena was teaching Pali but not Sinhalese.⁹¹ The priests were instructed in Pali only and the three lay students were taught Sinhalese. Actually it was described not as Sinhalese but as 'elu' or classical Sinhalese. The first examination for the students was held on 19.12.1874 by Baṭuvantudāvē Pandit. According to the examiners' report, we can safely say that the 'elu' class was mainly meant for the lay students and not for the priest students. There were five prescribed books for 'elu', namely Sidat Saṅgarāva, a standard grammar of the Sinhalese language, Guttila Kāvya and Sāvul Sandēśaya, two poems written in the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries, Muvadev Dāva, the first surviving Sinhalese poem, and Siyabas Lakara, a book on poetics.⁹²

The students (who were) in the class were unable to 'hear' from the teacher the meaning of the verses⁹³ in Muvadev Dāva and were exempted from that part of the test. Sanskrit was started in September, 1875, and after a sixteen months course in December 1876 only three pupils

91. 'Vidyodaya pirivena pihitavīmē pradhāna adhyāśaya nam pāli bhāṣāva puhunu kerimayi. evāni śāstra śālāvaka sanskr̥ta saha sinhala devāni vaśayen igānvīma nisāka lesama anargayi.

The Report of the Examiners' in Sinhalese, in 1876, written by W.P. Ranasinha, on 6.1.1877.

92. 'Eluva pilibāṇḍa vibhāgayē āvēdanaya'.

93. The lessons were described as 'pot assa gannavā' (listen when teacher explains).

offered it as a subject. In the month of December 1878, we are in a position to count the number of students who were studying at Vidyodaya Pirivena. According to the examiners' report there were fortysix priests in five classes and eight lay students, in 1877.⁹⁴ These reports are valuable, as they mention the number of students in a class and the number who offered themselves for the examinations.

From the very beginning Vidyodaya Pirivena attempted to impart knowledge in the Pali language and it was recognised as the creator of the tradition of Pali scholars with a lesser knowledge in Sanskrit and Sinhalese. This system of respecting Pali was continued even in 1890, and the organisers never thought that proficiency in Sinhalese was a design of scholarship. According to the syllabus in 1890, twelve books were prescribed for the Pali language and literature and six texts for Sanskrit language and literature, while Sinhalese language and literature was limited only to three texts. In 1891, one more text was added to the list of Pali books, the list of Sanskrit books remained unchanged, while Sinhalese language and literature was studied through *Sīdat Saṅgarāva* and *Sālaḷihini Sandēśaya* only.⁹⁵ In the light of this

94. These reports and the question papers of the early years of Vidyodaya are preserved at the National Archives and Vidyodaya Pirivena Library.

95. Y. Paṇṇānanda, op.cit, pp.204-205.

evidence we can conclude that Vidyodaya Pirivena was slowly developing as a seat of Pali learning, in the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

We are unable to testify to the position of Vidyāṅkārā Śāstra Śālāva⁹⁶ at its beginning, since we have no information regarding its initial activities. But a valuable record kept by Kirivattuḍuvē Śrī Pragnāsāra nāyaka thera,⁹⁷ a pupil of Vidyāṅkārā at the dawn of this century who later became its principal, incline us to believe that the system prevailing at Vidyāṅkārā was also similar in many respects to that of Vidyodaya. The priest students who attended classes were accommodated at Vijayasundarārāmaya, Hunupiṭṭiya. Classes were held separately for the bhikkhus and the laymen. From eight to eleven in the morning the lay students were instructed, while the bhikkhus attended classes in the afternoon from two to six. It was a five day week for the students. The Fullmoon day and the New moon day were holidays for all.

Apart from this routine duty, some pupils were privileged to have a separate and informal class for themselves. Mātara Dhammavamsa, the founder of Siri Mangala Pirivena, Mātara, and Mātālē Dhammārāma, the founder of

96. The founders were reluctant to employ the term 'pirivena' at the beginning, but Dharmārāma introduced it as a 'pirivena' in 1902.

97. The late nāyaka thera was born on 7.2.1891, and entered Vidyāṅkārā in 1901, and died in September 1970.

Vidyānanda Pirivena, Niṭṭaṃbuva, attended such an informal class where they were taught Mahā Siddhānta Kaumudī and Tarka Sangraha, and others who were free at that hour were asked to join the class, which would benefit them in the future. Any student who entered the premises was not allowed to leave the place without learning something, and it is said that even during the time of illness the pupils were taught by Dharmārāma, who allowed them to sit on the carpets by the side of his sickbed.⁹⁸

But the opening of Vidyāṅkārā Pirivena must have revived the forgotten rivalry between the two founders and the animosity between these two seats of learning is glaringly evident, if one examines carefully the existing materials in the newspapers and other journals at that time. When Vidyodaya Pirivena was developing as a seat of Pali learning, Vidyāṅkārā Pirivena preferred to cultivate the learning of Sanskrit. K. Dharmārāma⁹⁹ was the only bhikkhu at that time who learnt Sanskrit from an Indian scholar, whose scholarship he compared with that of Śrī Rāmacandra Bhāratī,¹⁰⁰ the poet, who lived during the period of Toṭagamuvē Śrī Rāhula. Before

98. Śrī Dharmārāma Sāhitya Amkaṣa, edited by T. Dharmakīrti, (1961), pp. 17-18.

99. Kalapaluvāvē Dhammārāma, though he signed his name as K. Dharmarama, he was popularly known as Ratmalānē Dharmārāma, after the name of his teacher.

100. The author of Bhakti Śataka or Bauddha Śataka, whose life has become a legend among the ordinary people in Ceylon.

Śrī Matr̥ Bhūtēśvara Śarma Śāstrī, this Sanskrit scholar, arrived in the Island in 1869,¹⁰¹ it seems that Dharmārāma suffered heavily in exploring his first lessons in that language. Sanskrit books were scarce and messengers were sent by Dhammāloka, his teacher, to the temples of the low-country and up-country in search of Sanskrit books. His biography announces the poor results of the search and mentions that they only received Sārasvata, a grammar of Sanskrit, with a part of its commentary and a part of Bālāvabhōdhana. Baṭuvantuḍāvē Pandit promised to supply him with a Mugdhabōdha, a Sanskrit grammar in Vanga script.¹⁰² These difficulties may have created a desire in Dharmārāma to go the Sanskrit scholar for studies. At his feet Dharmārāma studied from Tarka Sangraha and was continued in Sanskrit grammar and other affiliated fields. When Dhammāloka produced the periodical 'Satya Samuccaya' as a rival to 'Samaya Sangrahava', Dharmārāma contributed an article on Sanskrit grammar in July 1873. After his studies when his teacher started 'Vidyālankāra Śāstra Śālāva' Dharmārāma compiled 'Sanskṛta Śabda Mālā'

101. Lakrivikirana, 16.5.1869. Dharmārāma mentions his pupilship in the introduction to Jānakīharana.

102. P. Rāmacandra, op.cit, pp.16-17.

as a handbook in Sanskrit grammar for the students in 1876, since there was no suitable^{text} for them.¹⁰³

The interest of Dharmārāma in learning Sanskrit reached its culmination in a great scholarly work in 1889. Dharmārāma restored the stanzas of the now existing Jānakīharana, a mahākāvya, written in Ceylon during the fifth century, by rearranging all the Sanskrit words which came in the Sinhalese paraphrase of the twelfth century into a metre. By that time this poem was lost in Ceylon and India and scholars were engaged in research work on this mahākāvya. The Sinhalese paraphrase available in Ceylon ran up to the twenty second stanza of the fifteenth canto. Before Dharmārāma started work on this project, in 1870, James D'Alwis in his 'Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit, Pali and Sinhalese Literary Works of Ceylon', had for the first time published the opening ten stanzas of the ninth canto reconstructed into a metre by Baṭuvantuḍāvē Pandit, with an introduction on the poem.¹⁰⁴ This introduction may probably not have influenced Dharmārāma, as it was written in English, two decades previously. Since Baṭuvantuḍāvē exhibited no further

103. Sanskrta Śabda Mālā Hevat Sanskrta Nāma Varanāgilla, (1876), Colombo. This book was just like a reply to 'Pāli Nāma Varanāgilla' of the Vidyodaya head, published in 1873.

104. James D'Alwis, A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit, Pali and Sinhalese Literary Works of Ceylon, Vol. 1, (1870), pp. 188-195.

interest in reconstructing the poem for nearly two decades, Dharmārāma started on it and on 1.6.1889, in an editorial in 'Dinakara Prakāśaya', a newspaper, announced the completion of Jānakīharāṇa Mahākāvya.

Dharmārāma received ten thousand rupees as the cost of printing from C.H.De Soysa and the manuscript was undergoing printing in 1890, when suddenly the lost interest of Vidyodaya Pirivena and its disciples seems to have appeared again in 1890, after a period of silence over two decades. J.S.Rājasundara Āraci,¹⁰⁵ one of the three lay pupils who had offered Sanskrit as a subject at their examination in 1877 and the private physician of Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala nāyaka thera, printed a reconstructed version of the first and second cantos of Jānakīharāṇa Mahākāvya in 1890 at Lankābhinava Viśrta Press of Baṭuvantudāvē Pandit.¹⁰⁶

In the introduction of this slim volume he made it a point to mention that Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala, his teacher, had been engaged in a reconstruction of the Mahākāvya (for a long time which he could not duly complete and

105. In the examiners' report his name comes as 'Sēdaramā', but he was popularly known as 'Sēdaram Āraci'.

106. It is regrettable to note here the omission of this edition by late Dr.S.Paranavitana and Dr.C.E.Godakumbura in their edition of Jānakīharāṇa in 1967 and 1969. It seems both these editors were unaware of this text and they have dated Rājasundara's edition as 1903. Jānakīharāṇa, edited by Parānavitana and Godakumbura, introduction, (1967), p.xxvii, (1969) p.xix.

stated that on Sumangala's advice he was now undertaking the work himself.

At a glance one can realise that Rājasundara's edition was a malicious attempt to discredit the work of Dharmārāma which would reach the hands of the readers very soon. K. Dharmārāma wrote the introduction on 3.8.1890 and the book was available to the readers in early 1891. This was not a haphazard work like that of Vidyodaya Pirivena, but one of the most significant contributions made in Ceylon in recent times to the development of Sanskrit literature. After collating all the available copies of the old Sinhalese paraphrase in the libraries of Vanavāsa Vihārāya, Bentara, and the Government Oriental Library, Colombo, he restored up to the twenty second verse of the fifteenth canto.¹⁰⁷ In his introduction he clearly exhibited his acquaintance with the research work of other scholars in India and sometimes criticised their views.

After the publication of the two cantos of Jānakīharāṇa before the already announced edition of Dharmārāma, the scholars of Vidyodaya were in no way ready to accept this remarkable contribution of Dharmārāma, their rival

107. K. Dharmārāma, Jānakīharāṇa, introduction, (1891), p. xv.

scholar.¹⁰⁸ Lakrivikirana, a Sinhalese newspaper, in its editorial belittled the attempts of Dharmārāma of Vidyāṅkara Pirivena as even not worth consideration, since Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala had already completed the first and the second cantos last year.¹⁰⁹ This editorial may look ridiculous if one examines the printed text of Rājasundara. Rājasundara, the editor, has mentioned that Sumangala was engaged in the edition of the poem, but he has never named him as the compiler of the reconstructed version of the poem which he has published. If Sumangala had already completed the restoration of these two cantos, why he could not publish it under his own name, when a printing press was actually situated in the premises is inexplicable.

The editor of Lakrivikirana was a pupil of Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala. When all these events and personalities are taken into consideration the malicious picture could be well seen. All of them who had connections with Sumangala and Vidyodaya Pirivena attempted to extol their teacher

108. Not only in 1891 but also in 1967 and 1969 when Professor Senarat Paranavitana and Dr. C. E. Godakumbura edited their edition of this poem the non-acceptance is obvious to the critical reader. Dr. Godakumbura who wrote the Sinhalese introduction shrewdly refrains from comments on Dharmārāma's work. Dr. Godakumbura was a disciple of Maḍugallē Siddhattha whose teacher was Sumangala. Dr. Godakumbura mentions the rare opportunity of learning at the feet of this therā, in his Sinhalese Literature, (1955), footnote, p. 149.

109. Lakrivikirana, 12.6.1891 and 19.6.1891.

as the pioneer in restoring Jānakīharāṇa, though it was actually completed by Dharmārāma, so as to bring credit to Vidyodaya Pirivena.

'Satya Samuccaya', the organ of Vidyāṅkārā Pirivena, then produced an article of D.D.Disanayaka of Katunayaka on the 'phrases and the knowledge of the editor of Lakrivikirana'.¹¹⁰ When reading this article it is obvious to the reader that the article which had appeared in Lakrivikirana was believed by the scholars and the followers of Vidyāṅkārā Pirivena to be by Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala, and in his reply in 'Satya Samuccaya' the critic cited erroneous separation between words in Sumangala's Bālāvatāra edition.¹¹¹ The critic further suggested that it was not his intention to expose small mistakes in a scholarly composition like Bālāvatāra of Sumangala, but since the editor of Lakrivikirana had attacked Dharmārāma and his contribution as a bundle of gross mistakes, he wanted to expose the critic who sees the faults of others.

Lakrivikirana resumed its attack on Dharmārāma and Jānakīharāṇa in an article by D.C.W.Jayawardana in which he stated that the introduction to Jānakīharāṇa in Sinhalese

110. Satya Samuccaya, edited by R. Dharmārāma, on 30.6.1891, and 31.7.1891.

111. Buddham tidhā'bhivanditvā buddhambuja vilocanam for Buddham tidhā'bhivanditvā buddhambujavilocanam.

demonstrates Dharmārāma's ignorance of the Sinhalese language while the text he restored exhibits his inability to understand Sanskrit.¹¹² Only the impartial reader will be able to assess these baseless charges made against Ratmalānē Dharmārāma.¹¹³ On tenth of July 1891, the editor of Lakrivikirana, it seems making attempts to save his face, wrote that they have no time to spare on these futile controversies with the ignorant.¹¹⁴ But the busy editor who thought the controversy was futile continued the allegations of D.C.W.Jayawardana in Lakrivikirana on 18.7.1891.

112.Lakrivikirana, 19.6.1891.

113.I will compare the first stanza of both editions here.

Rājasundara, 1890.

āsīdavanā matibhōgabhārā-
ddivovatirṇā nagarī va divyā
kṣatram nalasthānaśami samṛddhyā
purāmayōdhyēti purī parardhyā.

Dharmārāma, 1891.

āsīdavanā matibhōga bhārād
divāvatirṇā nagarīva divyā
kṣattrānalasthāna śami samṛddhyā
purā mayōdhyēti purī parārdhyā.

The European printing would be as follows;
āsīdavanā matibhōgabhārād
divāvatirṇā nagarīva divyā
kṣattrānalasthānaśami samṛddhyā
purā Ayodhyēti purī parārdhyā.

114.Lakrivikirana, 10.7.1891.

'Luhuguru' in 'Dinakara Prakāśaya' on 1.8.1891, while praising the laborious attempts of Dharmārāma pleaded with him not to be disturbed by these unruly elements who know little of literature.

"pavulaka upayanno ṭikaya kannō nam vāḍi mayi
 aḍuluḥuṇḍak vuni nam un kannet bāna bānamayi
 mehev deyak kara dennō ātnam ē ṭikamayi
 yamak kamak dat pamanin āda kiyanno bohomayi"

(In a family the breadwinner who feeds many mouths is being subjected to criticisms when something goes wrong, without considering his efforts. Only a handful of scholars are in the Island who will devote time for a work of this nature but there are plenty to criticise the attempt.)

Again on 14.8.1891, Lakrivikirana published a special issue on the controversy on Jānakīharaṇa. It contains three articles written anonymously and other articles contributed by D.A.Vickramasinha of Biyagama, K.D.Candrasekara of Kalutara, D.C.Virasuriya of Ratnapura and Kustan Gunavardana of Alutgama. In all the articles Dharmārāma and his contribution were attacked uncritically and unsympathetically.

Telgē Mattes Fieris of Lunāva on 29.8.1891 in Dinakara Prakāśaya wrote under the caption of 'Jānakīharaṇa, the great poem' where he divulged the subversive

activities going on against Dharmārāma and Vidyāṅkara Pirivena. 'The editor of Lakrivikirana, a pupil of Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala, a priest pupil called Piyaratana and another young ex-priest pupil of Sumangala from Doḍandūva, have launched a collective campaign against Dharmārāma and his scholarship. These people are not scholars and there prevail rumours among the readers that Sumangala is the writer of these articles and has published them under the names of his pupils. This allegation implies a character assassination of a serious nature, as it may well be untrue. With reverence to Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala may I remind him that it is time for him to declare his innocence in the controversy'.

However with this article the controversy reached its end. The scholars of Vidyodaya Pirivena were unresponsive to this charge and Sumangala never thought that it was necessary for him to defend his position in the controversy, so still the allegation made by Mattes Pieris against Sumangala hovers in the lines of 'Dinakara Prakāśaya'.

Between Vidyodaya Pirivena, the seat of Pali learning and Vidyāṅkara Pirivena, the seat of Sanskrit learning, there appears to be an attitude of healthy emulation apart from the existing feelings of rancorous rivalry.

Vidyodaya Pirivena imparted knowledge of the Kaccāyana system of Pali grammar based on Bālāvatāra,¹¹⁵ while Vidyālankāra Pirivena made attempts to develop the Moggallāyana system of Pali grammar, another different tradition which may be indigenous. In 1896, the government press published Dharmārāma's edition of 'Pancikā Pradīpa' of Toṭagamuvē Rāhula. Rāhula's 'Pancikā Pradīpa' was the last attempt made in Ceylon to propagate the Moggallāyana system of Pali grammar and Dharmārāma revived it. Thus in 1896, the competition in the field of Pali learning also became obvious with the publication of this book.

Vidyodaya Pirivena and Vidyālankāra Pirivena had realised the importance of followers, which was nothing new under the pupillary succession in the field of learning. Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala, in 1887, started 'Parama Dhamma Cetiya Pirivena' at Ratmalāna, a branch of Vidyodaya Pirivena, under the principalship of Valānē Śrī Siddhārtha Dhammānanda, and disciples who had spent ten years at Māligākanda as students¹¹⁶ opened similar

115. Sumangala compiled a new commentary for Bālāvatāra namely 'Subodhikā Tīkā', and it could be considered as the great scholarly contribution made by Sumangala.

116. The classes were named thus according to Kalukoṇḍayāvē nāyaka thera. navīna vargaya, 8 vargaya, 7 vargaya, 6 vargaya, 5 vargaya, 4 vargaya, 3 vargaya, 2 vargaya, prathama vargayē prathama vargaya, prathama vargayē dvitīya vargaya.

branches of the mother institute at their village temples.¹¹⁷
 The students of Vidyāṅkārā Pirivena who had spent
 twelve years in learning at Pāliyaḡoḡa¹¹⁸ too followed
 the same system and enriched their headquarters with
 branches in the Island.¹¹⁹

With the advent of this new spirit in the field of
 learning, the Mūlasthānaya which we have discussed, with
 a net of subordinate temples where flourished the
 traditional learning, disappeared, giving place to the
 two new streams of learning, and these two institutions have
 created two great traditions in Ceylon to which all the
 bhikkhus of the country belong. The religious pupillary
 succession remains unchanged, but the rights of the
 scholarly pupillary succession were handed over either
 to Vidyodaya Pirivena or to Vidyāṅkārā Pirivena. The
 competitive animosity between the two traditions was not
 limited to the founders, but even the obedient followers
 of both the seats of learning continued the feeling of
 enmity in all literary fields in this century.¹²⁰

117. Y. Paññānanda describes 50 branches of Vidyodaya opened
 before 1911 in Śrī Sumangala Caritaya, pp. 236-237.

118. According to the certificate of progress received by
 Bāḡigama Ratanapāla, on 9.7.1891, which is now at Mahā
 Mantinda Pirivena, Mātara.

119. Before 1907 Vidyāṅkārā had 11 branches in the Island,
 namely Sadānanda, Mahā Mantinda, Vidyāvārdhana, Vidyādarśana,
 Agrabōdhi, Paṇḡitaratna, Mahācētiya, Padmāvati, Nāḡārāma,
 Vidyāratna, Mahēndrabāhu.

120. Martin Wickramasinha was ridiculed by Malalagama Dhīrānan-
 da of Vidyodaya for employing the mukkam (nasal)
 language of Vidyāṅkārā Pirivena.

The young ex-priest of Doḍandūva, one of the accused in the controversy on Jānakīharāṇa, on 8.4.1902 contributed an article to 'Sarasavi Saṇḍarāsa' the Vidyodaya-sponsored organ of the B.T.S on 'na kāra hā ṇa kāra yedīma', where he suggested employing na (the cerebral ṇa) in the words 'karaṇa, maraṇa and daraṇa', adhering to the rules in Sanskrit, which prescribes the use of na after ra. Undoubtedly this system is still followed by the Vidyodaya scholars. But M.C.Perera of Sēdavatta replied in an article on 25.4.1902 in the same paper, contradicting the ideas of the ex-priest Doḍandūvē Dharmasena. He was arguing on the lines of Vidyāḷankāra Pirivena. This controversy on na kāra and ṇa kāra continued for nearly six months and on 12.9.1902, the editor of 'Sarasavi Saṇḍarāsa' appealed to both parties to conclude the controversy.

Both Vidyodaya and Vidyāḷankāra had great respect for the learning of Pali and Sanskrit as the foregoing discussion aptly illustrates. Despite all the sentiments attached to these two great institutions, if we truly face the facts we have to accept the comparatively unimportant service rendered by these two seats of learning in the development of Sinhalese language and literature, during the period we discuss. Scholars of both schools attempted to exhibit their knowledge in Pali and Sanskrit, while

Sinhalese was allowed to suffer. Proficiency in Pali and Sanskrit were regarded as the qualifications of a scholar by the founders of these two institutes. Sinhalese language and literature was benefited only on a small scale, when compared to Pali and Sanskrit learning in the Island. Even that I regard as an extraneous service received by the Sinhalese language when all the avenues of learning were devoted to Pali and Sanskrit. The first signs of an interest in Sinhalese came before the opening of the two pirivenas. In the 'Samaya Sangrahava' edited by Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala, he started to comment on Sidat Saṅgarāva, the grammar of the Sinhalese language and this article was continued until 1.8.1874 up to the discontinuation of the magazine. But during the first appearance of 'Satya Samuccaya' of Dhammāloka in 1873, the editor published an article on Sanskrit grammar ignoring the Sinhalese language. After the disappearance of 'Samaya Sangrahava', Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala collected the published articles and printed them under the title 'Sidat Saṅgarāva' with its old commentary in 1884. Before this Baṭuvantuḍāvē had published an edition of 'Sidat Saṅgarāva' in 1877. Both texts were similar in their interpretations and in 1884 Vidyodaya was fortunate to

121. Samaya Sangrahava, edited by H. Sumangala, Vol. 1, No. 4, (15.2.1873).

have two editions of the same grammar to the credit of their scholars.

Meanwhile 'Satya Samuccaya' of Vidyāḷankāra Pirivena was restarted by Don Daniel Jayatilaka Senanayaka of Pāliyaḡoḡa on 4.5.1887 and this time an anonymous article appeared in this magazine on 'Sidat Saṅgarāva'. The article was attributed to Dharmārāma by the readers. Sometimes a marked difference was obvious in the interpretations between Sumangala and Dharmārāma.

The interpretation of 'prathamā vidhāyaka upāṅga sūtraya' ¹²² by Dharmārāma met with a series of criticisms in Lakminipahana in 1889.¹²³ The popular belief was that these attacks though anonymous were written by Hikkaḡuvē Sumangala. 'Cirantana'¹²⁴ and A.D.Perera joined the anonymous critic in Lakminipahana and they made attempts to safeguard the interpretations of Sumangala and Baṡuvantuḡāvē. On 16.6.1889 Dharmārāma accused Baṡuvantuḡāvē in 'Satya Samuccaya' of arrogantly distorting the old commentary and Sumangala of copying the same misinterpretation.

122. 'bajanuye pera vibat noveseṡi paḡata vutu vata'.

123. Dharmārāma's interpretation on the rule appeared on 30.4.1889, in Satya Samuccaya, Vol.2, No.17. Dharmārāma interpreted the terms 'vutu vata' as 'when it is needed to say' (kiva manā vī nam). Baṡuvantuḡāvē and Sumangala interpreted these two words as 'the subject' (ukta vastuva and uktārthaya).

124. Cirantana was a misfit in the controversy who could not even understand the derivation of words. He argued that 'vaktavya' can not appear in Sinhalese as 'vutu' and suggested that it has to be 'kiya yutu'.

Another unexpected element came in on 21.9.1889, in the columns of Lakminipahana. This was 'Madhyasthayā' of Mātara. He accused both the parties of destroying the old commentary according to their will and advised Sumangala and Dharmārāma to refer to Tuḍāvē Paṇḍita's edition for the correct word. Whoever the writer of this article was, he may have been a pupil of the Mīripānnē school, which was neglected by these seats of learning at that time. Sumangala and Dharmārāma may have thought that furthering this argument would result in supplying undue publicity to a group of scholars whom the Siamese sect had struggled to suppress. Under these circumstances both groups preferred to be silent on the argument, as their field was liable to an invasion by an unacceptable enemy. All these articles of Dharmārāma written on Sidat Saṅgarāva were published in 1902.

Apart from this edition of Sidat Saṅgarāva, the founder of Vidyodaya Pirivena was unable to prepare any other text in the name of Sinhalese learning after the establishment of the educational institute.¹²⁵ Here Vidyālankāra Pirivena goes rather further. Dharmārāma edited and published 'Dharma Pradīpikā' of Gurulugōmi, in 1886, Sidat Saṅgarāva and Hansa Sandēśaya in 1902.

125. I have omitted the Mahāvamsa translation of Sumangala and Baṭuvantuḍāvē which they started in 1874, and the edition of Kāvya Sēkharaya by Sumangala which was printed by Migeṭṭuvattē Gunānanda in 1872.

Most of the pupils of Vidyodaya Pirivena continued to develop Pali learning by editing and publishing Pali grammars and texts. But after a consideration of all the existing texts printed in the Island during this period which comes under our discussion, we can indubitably accept that the service of a single lay scholar, though an attachment was shown by him to Vidyodaya Pirivena and Hikkāḍuvē Sumangala, was much the most important and considerable in the development of Sinhalese learning in the country. Baṭuvantudāvē Pandit was the pioneer in the field of critical editions of texts in this period. He introduced the system of collating a considerable number of trustworthy old copies of a text and the comparison of texts and the selection of the most suitable word. His edition of Sidat Sangarāva in 1877 was the first of that calibre. He had collated four copies from various parts of the Island, namely Bimgiri temple in Vanniya, Vēragama in Sabaragamuva, Ginivāllē temple in Talpē Pattuva in Galle, and from Colombo. Apart from this, Baṭuvantudāvē Pandit published his editions of Ummagga Jātakaya and Anuruddha Śataka in 1866, Bhakti Śataka in 1868, Guttila Kāvya in 1870, Kāvya Śēkharaya in 1887, Ruvan Mala and Piṇḍum Mala in 1892, and helped in the editions of Girā Sandēśaya in 1883, Muvadev Dāva in 1880, part of Saddharma Ratnāvaliya in 1887 and part of Dham

Piyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya in 1891.

Following the footsteps of Baṭuvantuḍāvē some of the disciples of Vidyodaya Pirivena edited and published a few Sinhalese books. Vēragama Puncibandā edited Muvadev Dāva in 1880 and a part of Saddharma Ratnāvaliya in 1887, Mahagoḍa Gñāṇissara edited Saddharmāṭṭhāṭṭhā in 1889, Doḍampahala Sumangala edited a part of Dham Piyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya in 1891,¹²⁶ Mullēriyāvē Vipulasāra edited But Sarana in 1894, Maḍugallē Siddhārtha edited Kav Silu Miṇa in 1899, M.Dharmaratna edited a considerable part of Viśuddhi Mārga Sannaya in 1899, and Doḍandūvē Dharmasena edited Guttilaya in 1891, Mayura Sandēśaya in 1902, and Kav Mini Koṇḍola in 1905. Of the followers of Vidyāṭṭhāṭṭhā Pirivena, Bādīgama Dhammaratana edited the first part of Sinhala Bōdhi Vamsaya in 1891 and Baddegama Gunaratana continued the next portion in 1898 and D.B.Jayatilaka edited Budugunāṭṭhāṭṭhā in 1894. The Sinhalese editions and their commentaries of Vidyodaya and Vidyāṭṭhāṭṭhā exhibit one characteristic which had not appeared in the Pali and Sanskrit texts. In these two great institutes the Pali and Sanskrit texts were taught according to the

126. Lakrivikirana, 18.9.1891,
Dinakara Prakāśaya, 21.10.1891.

'six fold descriptions' (ṣaḍākāra varṇanāva),¹²⁷ and this system was supposed to be the proper way for a scholar.¹²⁸ Unfortunately all these scholars, the products of the two great traditions, did not even consider a Sinhalese text worth interpreting in accordance with that system. As a result of this second grade treatment received by the Sinhalese books, the gravity of editing a classical text was underestimated by the people who could barely do more than read and write. Those who found copies of an old text lying in a personal library or a temple rushed it through the press with the claim to be an 'edition' of a text. The printers also easily assisted these 'editors' in ruining the ancient texts, in this manner. Some editions appeared under the name of a pupil who claimed his teacher's tradition, but he was — the third or the fourth listener and was not a direct student of that tradition. Some have copied down the old commentaries of a text and printed them as a 'new commentary' (abhinava sannaya) on a book. Many unnamed

127. Kirivāttuḍuvē nāyaka thera also mentions this system in the article mentioned earlier. This system is not followed now in the pirivenas. According to this method the rules of grammar are taught in six descriptive ways. Those are, pada sambandhaya, pada vibhāgaya, padārtha, pada vigrahaya, vuktāvukta naya, cōdanā parihāra.

128. I am grateful to Dr. Horana Vajiragñāna thera, for the information, and he described a person who studies a book according to this system as knowing it like gold. (rattaran ṭikaṭa dānavā).

experts, scholars and priests edited books under titles such as 'samartha sthavira kenek' 'samartha paṇḍita kenek'. Thus we come across a flux of such printed pseudo-scholarly pretensions in the Sinhalese language and literature in this period.¹²⁹ It seems that such people had only received an elementary knowledge in reading and writing and under no circumstances can they be regarded as scholars. They have numerically enriched the Sinhalese language and literature with these printed texts, but indubitably in the light of scholarly standards it was not a service but a great harm in the field of Sinhalese learning. The only two names we can exclude here from this list of 'editors',¹³⁰ are Siridiyes Silva, or Bēruvala Gurunnānsē and Albert Silva of Bentara, products of the Mīripānnē school and Bentota Vanavāsa Vihāraya, who edited Parevi Sandēśaya in 1873 and Makaradhvaja, Maha Haṭana and Nīlakobō Sandēśaya.

The seats of learning of the Amarapura sect, as we have discussed earlier, were not different to the two great

129. I am reluctant to add a list of nearly twenty names here, as it will be of no help for the student of literature.

130. Out of all the editors only these two names can be mentioned as the direct pupils of a tradition. But I should like also to include two other scholars of this period, namely B. Gunasekara, the editor of 'Rājāvaliya' (1899) and 'Mayura Sandēśaya' (1880) and A. M. Gunasekara, editor of 'Kusa Jātakaya' in 1897; whose pupillary tradition they belong to I am unaware.

seats of learning in the development of Sinhalese studies, as they too offered a superior position to the study of Pali and Sanskrit. Since the attitude and acceptance of Sinhalese learning was in such a pathetic stage at these two developing great seats of learning of the Siamese sect, the development of a poetical tradition in Sinhalese amidst these scholars would have been incredible and unimaginable. The attitude of these Sanskrit and Pali scholars towards Sinhalese poetry was extremely unfavourable and the development of new poetical literature in Sinhalese was sponsored by a group of writers, who were not accepted by these scholars as poets in face of their own superior knowledge in Sanskrit and Pali.

Chapter five

EVOLVEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE NEW POETICAL TRADITION IN SINHALESE (1852- 1875)

At the beginning of this period we discuss, among the traditional seats of learning which belonged to the Siamese and the Amarapura sects, only the School of Mīripānnē exhibited the signs of an attachment to the development of Sinhalese poetry. The seat of Mīripānnē, under the principalship of Mīripānnē Dhammaratana upto 1851 and Koggala Dhammatilaka after that, became famous and has secured an interesting position in the annals of Sinhalese poetic tradition. The only source we have at our hands to evaluate the existing standards of traditional knowledge, talents of writers and the critical theories of the Sinhalese poetic tradition in 1852, is the activities and the engagements of the poets and scholars of this seat of learning.

In Gaṅgaru Vanana (Gangārōhaṇa Varṇanāva) which described the opening ceremony of Jētavanārāmaya, Goḍapiṭṭiya, Akurāssa, Tōmis Samarasēkara Disānāyaka, — the author of the poem, praised the patroniser of the festival in the following verse in 1806.

"sasara sarana sav sat dam amāven satoṣvā
 saga pavaga sāpat dun dam radun dam saṅgun sev
 mula mādaga vanin mē tun genē mul kivū nam
 patala māti saṅdek vī mē purē kit dedek van" ¹

(There lived in this city a famous gentleman, who had a great faith in Lord Buddha who had allowed the people of this world to achieve the comforts of the Heaven through his teachings, and in those teachings, and in His disciples. The name of this gentleman could be formed when one picks the initial, medial and the final syllables (vana) of the first three ganas of this poem.)

David De Saram, the patroniser of the festival, sent copies of this poem to his colleagues of the Southern province inviting their criticisms on the composition. Not surprisingly the receivers wanted to belittle the poem and the Mudliar Abēsinha of Galle asked for criticism on the book from Mīripānnē Kavitalaka Dhammaratana. But the scholar-poet-priest at first declined his invitation to show the defects of the poem. Eventually he succumbed to the pressure of the Mudliar. With hesitation he wrote;

"sasara sarana sav sat dam kivū tun genēhī
 agakura narakayi"

(In sasara, sarana and sav sat dam, the first three ganas, the last syllable-akura- is incorrectly mentioned.)

1. T. S. Disānāyaka, Gangārōhana Varṇanāva, edited by P. F. Abeyvikrama, (1933), Mātara, p. 2.

And he supported his theory by saying;

"ekagura dematek veyi tun gurek mat sayak veyi
etakoṭa deganek veyi, tun genē kivu tñēhī
niyamaya vāradīlā siv genek vī tibennā"

(One long syllable is two mātrās and sav sat dam has six mātrās, and thereby it consists of two ganas. Therefore there exist four ganas in the place where the poet mentioned only three.)

The poet, who received the critique in 1807, defended his position and said that what he had meant to express was not the syllables but the characters (vana).

"kav sat sit mena dat pasasna dana sav sat dam viyū mē genē
daknā tun guru mat namin vana sayak vē in kivem ak vanāyi
dannō bē vana halmayannama ganit ... "

(As there are six characters in this gana called sav sat dam those who are conversant with poetry will pick up only the last character that is M.)

The poet and the critic concluded their controversy at a friendly discussion in 1807. Much later, James D'Alwis printed 'Sidat Saṅgarāva' in 1852 at the government press.² In its remarkable introduction,³ while discussing modern Sinhalese poets he mentioned Mīripānnē Dhammaratana, and

2. The printed year of this book is incorrectly mentioned by the Sinhalese writers and attributed to 1851. D'Alwis printed the translation of the text of Sidat Saṅgarāva in 1851 at the Wesleyan Mission Press, but this version with the introduction was published in 1852 at the government press.

3. Up to this time all literary historians have reverentially accepted this introduction, and repeated it with slight differences.

expressed his view on 'sav sat dam', pronouncing the incorrectness of Mīripānnē.⁴ Furthering his argument D'Alwis stated that though the founder of the Mīripānnē School had found faults in other poets even his own compositions were not devoid of blemishes; and he illustrated his argument with two verses of Dhammaratana.

The ideas of James D'Alwis caused a great upheaval among the writers and the disciples of the Mīripānnē School. Those who were against the achievements of this school on the caste issue engaged in composing verses to ridicule and belittle the merits of the scholars of Mīripānnē. The unpleasant publicity germinated through the statements of D'Alwis annoyed the then principal of the school, Koggala Dhammatilaka, the eminent pupil of Dhammaratana, who contributed an article in verse to the December issue of 'Śāstrāḷankāraya'⁵ edited by John Pereira, the author of 'Heladiv Radaniya', criticising the views of James D'Alwis on Dhammaratana's theory on 'sav sat dam' and the two verses of Dhammaratana. In the article he traced the history of this new critical movement levelled against the erudition of the scholars of the Mīripānnē School.

4. '... this critique of the priest, no less unjust than wrong ...' James D'Alwis, *The Sidat Saṅgarāva*, (1852), introduction, p.ccxl.

5. *Śāstrāḷankāraya*, edited by Mātrāgē John Pereira, Vol.1, No.6, (December 1853), p.45.

'The paraphraser's book on prosody compiled with the assistance of some ignorant people subsequently paved the way for malicious proclamations', Koggala Dhammatilaka alleged; and he promised his readers 'to illustrate the misinterpretations and inaccuracies of that book in public with verses and stanzas'.⁶

His main argument in the article was devoted to establishing his teacher's theory on 'sav sat dam'. According to the rules of prosody, a gana is a constituency of three 'varna' or 'vana'. If this rule is taken into consideration one will realise that there must be three ganas with nine varnas, in the line 'sasara sarana sav sat dam', and the reader who wants to form the name of the Mudliar following the instructions of the poet will therefore construct SARADAM and not SARAM, taking the initial vana of SASara, the medial vana of saRana and the final vana of sav sat DAM.⁷

6. metuvak kal pasu vi hapankama taban ē atvānumkārayā hituvakkāarakamayi kalē dada danan hā ekva sādā potak tatu dakvā ehi dōsavalvala venat nek at vānumhi tubū matu okkōṭama pēna men kiyanavā kīmak apit kav solō' Sav Sat Dām Vādaya, edited by H.P. Jayasuriya, (1873), p. 11, Though I have translated kav and solō as verses and stanzas this might give a different sense to the Western reader. Kav are based on mātrā chandas while solō is based on-varna chandas.

7. 'pera vanaṭa yedennē mul genē mul SA yannayi māda vanaṭa yedennē nam devānnē RA yannayi aga vanaṭa yedennē DAM kiyālā penennayi kadimaṭa SARADAM yayi kav himin nam tibennayi',
ibid, p. 3.

Finally he pronounced unsuitable the eating of rice, the staple food of the Sinhalese, by James D'Alwis and suggested grass in place of rice if he prefers to continue his nonsenseⁱⁿ/this manner. By this statement he represented James D'Alwis as a grass-eating bull, the symbol of stupidity in Ceylon. But the poet claimed that this was not a personal criticism against D'Alwis, and said the exposure of all the inaccuracies in D'Alwis's work was done out of consideration for his readers.⁸

In the January issue of Śāstrāḷankāraya in 1854 another article appeared by the same pen under the caption 'the controversy regarding the accusations aimed against the two verses of Mīripānnē Damruvan'.⁹ It seems to the reader that Dhammatilaka was now satisfied with the arguments he had put forward to establish the theory of his teacher in the first article, but that this article was needed to safeguard the two verses of Dhammaratana which had been subject to the criticisms of James D'Alwis. And at this point we have to bear in our minds that the controversy was not only on 'sav sat dam' as it has been traditionally accepted (to

8. kolom̃ba elu vanannāgē potē at vānumhī
 bohoma boru tibennā mē ārat tanhī tanhī
 lovāṭa vāḍa vaḍannā vū sitin ē siyallat
 tava tava mama pennā denṭa ōnā karannem,
 Op.cit, p.4.

9. Mīripānnē Damruvangē kav. dekaḱaṭa varada kīmak gāna
 karana vādaya.

be) but it was a controversy on the general compositions and the theories of Mīripānnē Dhammaratana.

At the outset of this article Dhammatilaka produced the two verses criticised by D'Alwis;

"piṭa paṭa gasamin ävidin surā pāna SĀLĀ
VAṬA vāda kaṭa gannak rā bomin matva ūlā".

"maṭa karunā äti bava palamuven MAMA
HAṬA dānunā mehi evu patini in kima".

James D'Alwis commented on these two verses in this way;

"Here ṭṭ (aṭa), the inflexion of the Noun ṭṭ (sālā), is removed to a new line".¹⁰

"And here ṭṭ ṭṭ (mama haṭa)(which is divided into two) is incorrect; since the dative is formed by the addition of the inflexion to the root ṭ (ma), but not to the inflected nominative case ṭṭ (mama), as in the case here".¹¹

Koggala Dhammatilaka was aware of the best tactics to face the critic and cited similar usages from classical poems which show the affinities between his teacher and the classical poets. 'Muvadev Dāva',¹² the oldest

10. James D'Alwis, op.cit, footnote, p.ccxliii.

11. ibid, footnote, p.ccxliv.

12. anē nuvaraṇa DELE
NUdula Dāmbadiv.

existing Sinhalese poem, and Sidat Saṅgarāva,¹³ the grammar of the Sinhalese language came to his rescue and finally Koggala incorrectly quoted from a Mayura Sandēśaya,¹⁴ the first known message poem in Sinhalese.

Koggala Dhammatilaka, though erroneous in quoting this Mayura Sandēśaya, which he may have done from memory, was firmly sound in his arguments and exhibits the standard of traditional scholarship which prevailed at the school of Mīripānnē. James D'Alwis's argument on the two compositions of Dhammaratana is wrong. He may have thought that these verses were fine examples of the 'padi dubā māda dosa', a blemish the poets must evade. According to the prosody the poet enjoys the licence to combine the last word of the first line with the first word of the second line, but not the end of the second line with the beginning of the third line. In these two — verses Dhammaratana has fully exploited this chance (varama) as a poet inside its limits. This could not be considered as a fault of the poet. But one can say that though the poet is privileged to employ such chances in versification the greatness of a poet lies in not using the license. Any expression in a poetic creation

13. 'namav pirisidu SĀBA
VINA yū anā vatman'.

14. 'tamā varadasa no DIS
NĒ monariṇḍu ekalhi'.
(a line of Sidat Saṅgarāva, mixed with a line of Kav Silumiṇa.)

must enrich the aesthetic beauty of the poem. The two verses cited by D'Alwis are structurally correct, but look awkward in the circumstances and this will destroy the enjoyment of the reader who is forced to search for the meaning.

Concluding his article in defence of his teacher's compositions, Koggala Dhammatilaka humorously stated that the author of the Sidat Saṅgarā translation must be rewarded with the whole country for interpreting that classical text, but that all the same he did not understand the small blemish in poetry called 'padī dubā māda dosa'.¹⁵

In the February 1854 issue of Śāstrāḷankāraya, under the title 'controversy on sav sat dam' ¹⁶ there appeared the arguments of Siṭṭināmaluvē Dharmārāma,¹⁷ popularly known as Siṭṭināmaluvē (the) Junior, in which he described the origin of the controversy in 1806 between his teacher and the poet of Gangārōhana Varṇanāva. Furthermore he added that even in the month of February 1807 the recognised 'sage-like teachers' of the Island, Karatoṭa and Bōvala, were in agreement with the points raised

15. padīdubā māda pamanak nodānenavāṭa mokada hoṇḍaṭa
 didī amutu tērum elu vanā Kolombā kenek lovaṭa
 kaḍima yasasak lāba gati tavat kenek nolābu lesaṭa
 mādiya mē raṭa dunnat bāhā oya keru hapan kamaṭa.

16. 'Sav Sat Dam Vādāya Gānamayi'.

17. Signed as Hitnāvaluvē Dharmārāma.

by his teacher. Unlike his colleague he never accused James D'Alwis or ridiculed his scholarship, but ^{accepting} his social status he simply criticised his acquaintance with disrobed men in the composition of his book.

It is not far from reality if we say that there was a great opposition to the activities of the Mīripānnē school among the upcoming scholars of the Govigama group. James D'Alwis was instructed in Sinhalese by Baṭuvantuḍāvē of Govi caste and an ex-priest of the Siamese sect. Mīripānna and Baṭuvantuḍāva are two villages in close proximity. All the criticisms on the 'disrobed' (sīralu) and the 'ignorant' (dada) were aimed at Baṭuvantuḍāvē Pandit, who had supplied the editor of Śāstrāḷankāraya the two Sanskrit verses which he printed on his title page.¹⁸ The Mīripānnē school belonged to the people of Durāva caste and the bhikkhus of Mīripānnē school were ignored by the bhikkhus of the Siamese sect and the Govigama caste. We can assume that many scholars of the Govigama caste were reluctant to accept the scholarship of the Durāva caste.¹⁹ Otherwise the criticisms written in English by D'Alwis alone could not have reached people of all the walks of life in such a short time who

18. John Pereira thanked Baṭuvantuḍāvē in the first issue of Śāstrāḷankāraya for the two stanzas with their meaning.

19. Some of them call themselves 'viddattu' or scholars. J.B.Perera, Niti Ratnāvalī, (1911), p.110.

had no knowledge of that language. The pupils of Dhammaratana were heavily subjected to humiliation by these critics and Siṭṭināmaluvē warned them to be careful at the end of his article.²⁰ After this it is apparent that the pupils of Dhammaratana were ready to continue the controversy on the theory of 'sav sat dam', since they believed further arguments on Dhammaratana's own compositions were unnecessary.

In the same February issue of Śāstrāḷankāraya, after the article of Dharmārāma, a note was added by the editor giving as a reason for the delay in printing an intelligently written article by one Ubhayasēkara, the fact that his address was not mentioned, and saying that he would publish articles of any group who would support or oppose the views of Koggala Dhammatilaka. It seems John Pereira, the editor, had deliberately delayed the publication of the article by Ubhayasēkara and bred and nurtured the controversy for a few months in the office of the magazine, which would be beneficial for him in the circulation of the magazine. As a reply to the December issue of Śāstrāḷankāraya, 'a friend of mine' wrote D'Alwis, 'replied but the reply was not published for two months, and when

20. 'dadun ek velā mē raṭē bō lesin dān
 nitin kav solōval sādā siṭ vilasnen
 utum ē himinṭat sutanṭat nigā dī
 kiyannan tānin tān inḍan gon rālak sē,
 'kaṭa hindā varadinṭa veyi nūmbalagē, innet apit mē raṭē'.

a portion of it did appear in Śāstrālankāraya, in March 1854, it was accompanied by a rejoinder - not from the editor, but from the first writer'.²¹

If we take out the main arguments of Do.Ko.Pra. Ubhayasēkara ²² from the midst of a lengthy exposition of various grammatical errors of Koggala Dhammatilaka, it can be illustrated in the following manner. The poet of Gangārōhana Varṇanāva needed to denote the name SARAM. Since he did not mention whether the reader had to pick long or short syllables to form the name SARAM he has to indicate the last character in the third gana.²³ To establish his theory that the letter M is a varṇa (character) he cited the word YAVAHAN and the remarks of Sidat Saṅgarā about binduva as examples.

Now we are in a position to evaluate the arguments of both parties. The theory put forward by one party is that the reader who selects the initial, medial and final varṇas according to the instructions of the poet will get the name SARADAM. But the theory of the opposition

21. James D'Alwis, Contributions to Oriental Literature, Part i, (1863), preface, p.x.

22. His name is written D.C.F.OBEYASEKARA in English, but he writes the name in Sinhalese in this way.

23. luhu guruna beyak dakvā noki ē bävin hā
nama misa viritekvat yam genekvat sädum vas
noma pävasu nisat yam halkurek ek vanak nam
aga ganaṭa tibū ē hal mayannat vanak veyi.

was a back-tracking device which neglects the poet's actual words on the ganas. The name the reader must get eventually is SARAM. In order to form that name he has to pick up the three varnas SA, RA, and M. The Saram party selected the initial, medial and final letters or characters of the abovementioned ganas.

There exists more plausibility in the theory of Koggala Dhammatilaka, when the reader is unaware of the name of the Mudliar. If he follows the instructions carefully then at the start he will realise that the verse is written in accordance with the varna chandas and it is a stanza or a silō. It was composed in the Mālinī metre. Each line of this metre has to be composed with na gana, na gana, ma gana, ya gana and ya gana, which will consist of fifteen varnas or syllables.²⁴ Taking all these things into consideration the intelligent reader will select the name undoubtedly as SARADAM. This is more probable when the reader is unaware of the name before he starts reading.

As now we are aware of the theories of both the parties, we can impartially judge in fairness to the Saram party and the Saradam party, that both have justifiable interpretations, but that the Saradam party

24. na na ma ya ya yutēyam Mālinī bhōgi lōkaih,
 sasara / sarana / sav sat dam / amāven / satoṣvā,
 na na ma ya ya

is more effective and sound in their argument. There was no one in 1854 who could offer this simple judgement, and both parties dragged the controversy to an inconclusive end.

The Sanskrit term 'varna' is taken into Sinhalese as 'vana' which has two meanings, namely either a syllable or a letter. Syllable is associated with the prosody and letter with the alphabet. This twofold interpretation of the term vana supplied to both parties the grounds to argue. No scholar or clear thinking person intellectually stated this simple logical point, and this enabled both parties to add more minor controversial points into the main argument.

Koggala countered the main argument of D.C.F. Obeyasēkara, by saying that the YAVAHAN which he cited to prove his view referred to mātrā chandas and could not be applied to varna chandas in which this verse was written. Since Koggala's article appeared in the same magazine side by side with that of D.C.F. Obeyasēkara, we must believe that the editor of Śāstrāḷankāraya had given the article of D.C.F. Obeyasēkara to Koggala Dhammatilaka to read in order to prepare a reply for it. This unprecedented partiality to the Saradam party provided the necessity and encouragement to the Saram party to organise a magazine of their own, and with

Baṭuvantudāvē Pandit as the editor in April 1854 at the Catholic Press they published 'Yatalaba Saṅgarāva'. 'D.A.S.B.P.', D.C.F.Obeyasēkara and 'Ām Ak' contributed articles on 'sav sat dam'. Unfortunately they could add nothing new except the repetition of the argument of Obeyasēkara. But this time they criticised more poems of Dhammaratana as erroneous besides the earlier verses. Koggala Dhammatilaka continued his criticisms on binduva in Śāstrālankārāya and exposed some of the grammatical mistakes in the verses of D.C.F.Obeyasēkara.

Thus we note that by the month of April 1854, the main contention of the controversy was apparently forgotten by both parties and they had started fighting on some lesser points raised by them at the later stages of the argument. As both groups had insufficient intellectual materials for the controversy, they lost the measure of decency and started personal attacks on Baṭuvantudāvē Pandit in Śāstrālankārāya, in June 1854. His scholarship was condemned as pseudo and his title Pandit was ridiculed. He was addressed as 'hīralu gon kōlama' and 'ibē paṇḍi' by Ba.Na.Virasinha and Don P. Candrasēkara. In the May issue of Yatalaba Saṅgarāva D.C.F.Obeyasēkara, without contributing anything further to his theory, started abusive attacks on Koggala Dhammatilaka addressing him as 'Koggala mahanā', 'mahana

kōlama' and 'koggala miturē'. For the first time he slightly hinted at the caste of Koggala Dhammatilaka. "surā bomin hō gas madimin hō āvida kaleka yam kenek tosē" Finally he suggested to Koggala to return to his childhood discipline in dancing.²⁵

The personal attacks on the protagonists were serious. The reflections made by Ubhayasēkara on Dhammatilaka's caste infuriated many admirers and the editor of Śāstrāḷankāraya received articles signed Kōṭṭē Mukhasanvāsa Pārājikak, Kevul Handuruvā, Keyanu Goyanu, Ahamben Prādurbhūta Amana Paṇḍitayā and Saradam Andiris.²⁶ Koggala publicly remonstrated on the behaviour of the Saram camp and said that the controversy had become degraded to the level of drunkards. When Dhammatilaka wished to abandon the controversy there were many others to replace him, since now it appeared to be a controversy against a caste and not a debate on a literary point.

In the September issue of Yatalaba Saṅgarāva there appeared articles by Atī Adiyara Appuhāmy, Akusubāhu, Karō Appu, Karō of Vēradūva, and Habarakada Liyanagē Don Bastian De Silva Appuhāmy, but none of them touched on

25. 'sāka nātuvama vāḍiḥiṭṭiyan purudu karapu bālē
neka parasidu nātumvalaṭa karamin situ ālē
akavaṭu avulamin sivura norakina dasa silē
taka domi domi kiyā natāpan Koggala rālē'
Sav Sat Dam Vādaya, op.cit, p.50.

26. Most of the attacks were levelled at Baṭuvantudāvē, who used the title of Paṇḍita. He had resided at Kōṭṭē when he was a priest. His lay name was Andiris. But why he was named as Kevul or a person who had associated with the Karāwa caste is not known.

the main argument of the controversy and they got bogged down in irrelevant details. Meanwhile Śāstrāḷankāraya it seems was waiting till their opponents forgot the main controversy. They now felt that the Saram party was now evading the controversy without facing them. In October they published the 'victory issue' (vādābhibhavana patraya) with four articles. A.D.D.Sēkara in his contribution illustrated his theory with a design and transferred the controversy to a plane where others could hardly follow. Mātara Kavicandra Appuhāmy accused Baṭuvantuḍāvē Paṇḍit, Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala and James D'Alwis of ignorance. Tembon Kaḍiyā and Rā Bona Adiriyā in the last article praised the valour and sagacity shown by Koggala Dhammatilaka and his scholarship and allegorised the whole controversy into a fight between 'Yatalaba jackal' and Koggala. During the fight the Yatalaba jackal had been beaten by Koggala against the Śāstrāḷankāraya stone.

The Saram camp was not ready to give up so easily, and in haste they published anachronistic articles about Karatoṭa and Bōvala written even before the controversy was started by Koggala. Śāstrāḷankāraya had started the controversy in December 1853. But Yatalaba produced articles written on 15.11.1853 and 6.12.1853. After these ludicrous attempts they published the official views of Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala on the argument. (Earlier, there

were suspicions among the scholars of the school of Mīripānnē that Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala was the writer of the Obeyasēkara article.)²⁷ This article looks partial. But undoubtedly he made attempts to deliver a fair judgement. After tracing the origin of the controversy in a more academic way, he said that a gana is a constituent which consists of three long or short syllables. There are two terms to denote these syllables, that is 'varna' and 'Akṣara'. The author of Gangārōhana Varṇanāva eulogised SARAM Mudliar and he wanted the reader to locate the three letters or akṣaras that form the name Saram. Concluding his article he challenged the Saradam party to show any unchangeable rule to the effect that one must interpret the term varna as syllables only but not letters or characters.

His partiality is clear at this point. Even then if Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala had been generous enough to contribute this article eight months earlier, (the) hard feelings would not have occurred on either side. This belated judgement enriches the student of Sinhalese poetry with materials regarding the existing standards of poetical tradition in 1854 in the Island.

This controversy on 'sav sat dam' took place from

27. 'Ubhayasēkara namin pala kala gī pāṭha kav silō e siyala subaya min vennē sitā gena kelē Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala'.

December 1853 to October 1854, though most of the literary historians of the country are misled about the date.²⁸

With the assistance of the articles published for and against the theory of Dhammaratana we can assess the then existing critical standards in Sinhalese poetry.

The poets who participated in the controversy were aware of the difference between verses based on traditional mātrā chandas and verses founded on the imported Sanskrit varna chandas. Koggala Dhammatilaka at the beginning of the controversy declared that his party composed both 'kav' (rhymed stanzas) and 'silō' (varna stanzas). But when we read all the proceedings of the controversy which appeared in Śāstrāḷankāraya and Yatalaba Saṅgarāva we

28. W.F. Gunavardhana was one of the writers in the early part of this century who was correctly aware of the date of the controversy. Professor E.R. Saraccandra mentions the date as 1872, Dr. P.B.J. Hevavasam in his thesis on this period mentions the same, while Dr. P.B. Sannasgala did not mention any date. All these writers were misled by the edition of Sav Sat Dam Vādaya by Jayasēkara Abēruvan, in 1948, where he mentions the date as 1872. (p.iii). Abēruvan has copied the edition of H.J.L. Perera, in 1904, who copied it from the edition of Hendrick Perera Jayasūriya in 1873. Since Jayasūriya did not mention the dates of the controversy, others have believed that his edition was the collection of articles that had appeared in the magazines in the preceding year. Unfortunately this 1873 edition is not to be found in Ceylon and H.J.L. Perera's edition has misled them all. The original articles of the controversy appeared in Yatalaba Saṅgarāva and Śāstrāḷankāraya, copies of which could be read at Śrī Pragnāsēkhara Library, Navagamuva, Ceylon.

find only a small number of kay and all the others composed as silō. We can not say that these poets always adhered to the rigid rules of metre as in Sanskrit. In a varna stanza (silō) one must find the same number of long or short syllables arranged in the same pattern in each line. But Sinhalese poets though they employed the Sanskrit metre did not follow the rule in the same way. They have altered the syllable pattern, and these stanzas were criticised by other writers. Hitnāvaluvē Dharmārāma's poems were heavily subjected to criticisms on this point. A silō was composed by this Dharmārāma in the Mālinī metre in this way, which is wrong.

'mudaliñdu veta ev kalhi Abēsinha nam lat
vilasiñdu guna yut pinvat pasan ē mātindā'

When it is scanned it appears thus;

u u u u u u - - u u - - u - -
u u u u u u - - - u - - u - -

They knew how to scan (prastāra kirīma) a metre in long and short syllables. The ancient classical poems of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, such as Muvadev Dāva, Kav Silumiṇa, were read by these scholars. 'Vṛtta Ratnākara Pañcikāva, a Ceylon Sanskrit work on prosody, became the source of knowledge in this period on metre and Koggala copied it down from a manuscript of Baṭuvantudā-vē Pandit.

In regard to poetic language somewhat strong opposition prevailed among scholars to using words which ^{were} are alien to the Sinhalese language. The idea of Elu or ancient Sinhalese as the suitable vehicle for expressions in poetry was not found among those scholars, who did not consider the composition of poems a characteristic of a traditional scholar.³⁰ The colloquial Sinhalese was predominantly employed by the poets. What words are alien to Sinhalese language, therefore, was always a matter of argument. D.C.F.Obeyasēkara's word 'pebaravāri' for English February,³¹ Koggala's Tamil word 'nari' and Dhammaratana's Portuguese words, 'janel' 'bandēru' 'raban' and 'dusin' were subjected to criticism on these lines.

Knowledge of grammar in Sinhalese was in such a low ~~state~~ ^{that} most of these scholars' criticisms were devoted to exposing the grammatical mistakes in their opponents' compositions. But as they all employed the colloquial idiom in their poetry they could not adhere to the rules of classical Sinhalese. The standard of criticisms levelled against these grammatical errors can be well illustrated

30. James D'Alwis, discussed this point in the introduction to *Sidat Saṅgarā*, pp.xxvi- xxxiii.

31. Though Koggala attacked his opponent for employing English words he signed his own name in English, which later was criticised by others.

in this following verse and its criticism. Koggala wrote thus;

'tatu dakvā ehi dōsavalvala venat nek at vānumhī tubū
matu okkōṭama pēna men kiyanavā kīmak apit kav solō',³²

The criticism against these lines is as follows.

'pabaṇḍa mema satveni solōvē kiyanavā yāyi yedū kiriyē
api da matu yana debasa ekatuva yeduna kala vēmāyi nosariyē'
masada karu arutehi anākal buhu basin yeduvā nam sariyē
memada noma dāna vādayaṭa kav sadā gena naṭanavā siriyē
'mema kavehima dōsavalvala kī tānada
kama nāti val sadak yeduvē kumakaṭada',³³

(In the above verse the combination of api with matu kiyanava is wrong and it should be apa to look perfect.

(In dosavalvala of this verse why have you used the useless suffix 'val'?)

This allegation clearly shows the problem the poet had to face. Koggala was employing the colloquial language and he was correct in using it. The critic argues on the lines of classical grammar or the written language and he also was apparently correct. The critic's suggestion is good, but the problem is how to employ this classical grammar in the midst of this colloquial diction. The poets of this period faced this problem

32.Sav Sat Dam Vādaya,J.Abēruvan edition, (1948),p.2.

33.ibid, p.18.

by creating a different type of poetic diction which had not been employed by the poets of the traditional Sinhalese literature. It was associated with the spoken idiom and the colloquial language.

Śāstrālankāraya and Yatalaba Saṅgarāva, the journals which carried the articles regarding the controversy against the school of Mīripānnē, passed into extinction at the end of the controversy. Koggala Dhammatilaka to perpetuate the triumph composed 'Saradam Bali Yāgaya' (The planetary ritual on Saradam), a remarkably imaginative versification for that time though ignored by Sinhalese writers. During the time of the controversy his opponents had sarcastically reminded Koggala of his affiliations with dancing and those planetary rituals. This creation shows that those apt suggestions could not have been out of place. We have no evidence to prove whether the Koggala priest or his family had any connections with rituals of this nature. But this Saradam Bali Yāgaya clearly displays his acquaintance with the elements of a 'bali ritual'.

Dhammatilaka's imagination as a poet shows in his description of the situation, and he traced all the existing necessary elements for a planetary ritual in the surroundings whence germinated the controversy on 'sav sat dam' and the compositions of Dhammaratana. The popular

belief among the Sinhalese Buddhists of the Low-country is that the life span of a person is attributable to the nine planets who sometimes in accordance with the Zodiacal changes will wield a bad influence on him which will cause illness, headaches, madness, insanity, numbness, fever and talkativeness. Koggala and the disciples of the Mīripānnē school believed that James D'Alwis was afflicted by these maladies under the bad influence of some planets. Some demons had aggravated the diseases by assisting these planets. To cure the insanity and other illnesses of the invalid a bali ceremony had to be performed on the luckless critic, D'Alwis. The nine planets who influenced him were living in the vicinity of D'Alwis and they are as follows;

Ravi	-sun	- Denagama Gunaratana
Candra	-moon	- Mirissē priest
Kuja	-Mars	- Kōdāgoḍa priest
Budha	-Mercury	- Denipiṭṭiyē priest
Guru	-Jupiter	- Unavaṭunē priest
Śukra	-Venus	- a native physician
Śani	-Saturn	- Galātuṃbē Notary
Rāhu	-	- Attiḍiyē Dāvit
Kētu	-	- Balapiṭṭiyē priest.

The demons who have assisted these planets to aggravate the position of the innocent invalid were the scholars who

had inspired and patronised the theory on 'sav sat dam' and the compositions of Dhammaratana. These demons must be called to the arena to offer them suitable offerings in order to ward off the evil influence. Before calling them to partake of the offerings their representative effigies must be prepared by the priest of the ritual. It is said that ten models were to be erected and decorated according to the tradition before calling the demons, namely, four effigies of priest demons (mahana rakusu bali), one effigy of an ex-priest (sīralu baliya), one model of a notary (notāris baliya), two Mudliar models (mudali bali), one effigy of the Lord (hāmu baliya) and one model of the demon of toddy (surā yak baliya).

The origin of this ritual is closely connected with the controversy on 'sav sat dam', according to the poet Koggala. In every exorcistic ritual or planetary ritual at the beginning of the performance the priests of the ritual traced the origin of the ritual. Koggala similarly followed the characteristics of an actual ritual in the composition. Before the performance, the priest of the ritual (yāga ādurā) who was dressed shabily had to walk seven days in search of a suitable place for the ritual, and having made a vow to the sage Saradam must worship Dhammaratana and the god of Rīrigal Dēvāle. After this the erection and the decoration of the ten effigies are described

by Dhammatilaka following the pattern of the verses called 'Āmbun kavi' in a bali ceremony. The effigies are moulded on a frame made out of coconut branches, and banana stems. These frames with their figures on it can easily be lifted. One of the most elaborate figures in the ceremony is described thus by the poet Koggala Dhammatilaka.

"vam pasa gāba maḍa diyen - tet koṭa gal kāṭa lamin
pin bat saha anā ekaṭa - gāba tula lā situ lesin.
"santosa kara karana us - gāba mudunata sadati tos
sivuraluruva īṭa pahata - seda āmbamin nova kukus."

(The left side of the frame where the effigy is to be situated must be washed with muddy water and be pasted with small pebbles mixed with cooked rice which has been given for merit. The figure of the disrobed must be erected in the frame.)

The dreadful model of Baṭuvantudāvē was the subject of a long description. I will illustrate some of it here.

"siv riyanak sudu redit - pallaṭa āṇḍi lesa tavat
devuraṭa dāmu saram kabala- dat nāti nāmi panāvakut.
"vam ata kuḍa kabala pat - bastama saha dakunu at
gat nitarama vāda potada - vāhanayaṭa gavayekut.
"ās duṭa biyavana lesē - sivuralu yak ruva mesē
vistara kara āmbā nāvata - dakunata gāba tula tosē.
"pālu dakunu pasa ē gānat - mālu kukulu saha vāli māṭit
surā maṇḍi gena nāgaṇḍāt - purā e gāba tula lā yalit."

(Six feet of white cloth must be wound round the lower part of the body, a sarong must be put as a shawl around the shoulders and a curved comb without teeth must be on his head. An old umbrella rests in his left hand and a staff and a book on the controversy in the right hand. He rides on a cow. It is not a joyful scene in any way but a dreadful one. On the right side of the frame where the effigy is, the offerings have to be kept. Chicken, sand, earth and toddy yeast have to be packed in a Habarala leaf.)

After the recitation of the verses regarding the erection of the effigies the exorcist appeals to the nine planetary gods to cure the illness of the invalid. Galäṭumbē, the former teacher of D'Alwis, was a poet who was believed to be the writer of some verses during the controversy. Before the effigies are exhibited to the invalid these supporters of D'Alwis were described, inviting blessings.

"pā kalu gatakin dili äma	davasā
dī elu kavi bāṇḍa läba gat	ayasā
ē ralu Galäṭumbaya yana	piyasā
hīralu kivi meobaṭa seta	salasā"

(May the dark-skinned ex-priest of Galäṭumbē, who has gained illfame for composing verses anonymously for the controversy, accord blessings to the invalid.)

The invalid is brought to the arena after undergoing a long procedure in preparations, and lifting the white cloth which covers the baliya of the disrobed the effigy is exhibited to him.

the whole text a collection of three hundred and sixteen verses of the ritual.³⁵ Baṭuvantudāvē was the individual most insulted and humiliated in the 'Saradam Bali Yāgaya'. But all the others who have directly or indirectly assisted, even with a word of personal speech, though they did not contribute a single written word to the controversy, became the target of unsympathetic attacks from the Koggala poet. The chief of the priests of the Amarapura Nikāya, Bulatgama Sirisumanatissa, was thus insulted by mentioning his caste and his lust towards the old wife of a Mudliar.³⁶

After composing this interesting 'Saradam Bali Yāgaya' which may have brought all his opponents to silence merely through shame, as they could not compete with Koggala in insulting people in the name of literature and poetic creations, Koggala gave up robes and became a layman and in 1862 edited 'Lakminipahana', the first newspaper by a Buddhist, with a Sinhalese verse at the beginning of the paper in its title page. The employment of a Sinhalese verse in the first page was followed by the editors of

35. Unfortunately this composition is known only by name in Ceylon. Literary historians have refused to write anything on this work. I am grateful to Kalukoṇḍayāvē nāyaka thera for allowing me to read the book. There is a printed copy of this compiled by A. Gunasekara at Lankōdaya Press in 1904 with 250 verses, though Dr. P. B. Sannasgala has not seen it.

36. 'vāṭuna mut tana yuvala kaḍimayi valav hāmine deḍuma rasavi
egāna sene āti bavāt dannemi e ana balayen nosiṭa sāṅga vi'

newspapers after this. Koggala Don Johannas Panditatilaka Gurunnānsē, as he was then called, died before 1867, and we have come across an authentic composition by his pen printed in the same year, entitled 'Sat Satiya' or the seven weeks.³⁷ It was a description of the first seven weeks after the Enlightenment of the Lord Buddha, in eight verses. Not only its slimness stopped the composition becoming famous, but I believe the unique metre the poet has employed was hard to recite and memorise for the Sinhalese readers who always preferred to 'recite' poems. The metre consists of twentynine syllabic instants. What caused him to create this metre and how it could be recited is not known in Ceylon. One verse is as follows;

"ahasa päna suranaṭa tibunu budubava säka durāra pelahara
karalā
mihisa bäsa palaṅgaṭa uturuperadigukona siṭama yugapiya
nosālā
deyāsa sunimala kān silila isa isa dumiṇḍu sadahaṭa
novalā
melesa satiyak pasukeleya animisa netu pudaya karamini
lakalā"

(The Master who displayed miracles to dispel the doubts of gods regarding his Buddhahood, descended to the earth and spent a week on a seat to the Northeast of the Bodhi tree without closing his eyes at it, as a mark of respect.)

37. These eight verses appeared in printed form at the end of Sakvala Vistaraya of Mihipā thera, in 1867.

Don Andiris Tuḍāvē Paṇḍita Gunavardhana, one of the pupils of Mīripānnē Dhammaratana,³⁸ kept silence during the controversy on 'sav sat dam' and his teacher's theory. He may have preferred not to be an enemy to Baṭuvantuḍāvē Paṇḍit, his Pali teacher, and James D'Alwis whom he assisted in studying Sinhalese poetry. Though there are innumerable versifications attributed to him³⁹ we have only one small composition undoubtedly to his credit. He versified 'Dances from Italy' under the title 'Pransa Nṛtya Kāvya or Pransa Nāṭuma'.⁴⁰ The performance on which it was based took place in Colombo on 21.2.1856 and the poem was printed by Hendrick Perera at Lakrivikirana Press in 1867. It is a small poem of forty verses which shows the affinity of the poet with the classical Sinhalese poets. His poetic language is somewhat archaic when we compare it with the popular diction employed by the other poets of his own school.

"helasaraṇa raṅga dena saṇḍehi hāṇḍi vat ivatvata nāṇin yutu

dana

ema kalun tunupahasa lobakara anaṅga dena neka vehesa

viṇḍimina"

38. He was known as Tuḍāvē Sumanasāra when he was a priest.

39. The writers have mixed the works of his son P. Tuḍāvē Paṇḍita Gunavardhana with that of his father.

40. Anything foreign was 'French' to the Sinhalese at that time.

(The intellectuals who witnessed the bodies of these white women when dancing, were tempted to have intercourse with them and suffered mentally.)

He started the book with a long rhythmical portion which resembles the 'cūrṇikā' style in the folk tradition. After every ten mātrās the line has a pause (yati) and the combination of words and sounds gladdened the ear.

"sav dēsa tilaka baṇḍu - sav satara mini muḥudu-
sav sirin lova paṣiṇḍu - sav satan satana baṇḍu-
erōpā dēsayāṭa- dakunu digatura pihiṭi- itā sirisara pāvati-
itā paṇḍidana gāvasi- Itāliya yana namāti- itā soṇḍa
purek viya' ⁴¹

The longest metre in Sinhalese poetical works with fiftytwo mātrās was employed by the poet at the beginning of the poem. The same metre was for the first time used by Gajaman Nōnā or Dona Isabella Korneliya Perumal, a poetess from Mātara of the same caste as Tuḍāvē, who died on 14.12.1814. She versified the death of her father into this metre. The construction of this metre is interesting and in the annals of Sinhalese poetry we only have a handful of compositions which followed this metre.

41.D.A.Tuḍāvē Paṇḍita Gunavardhana, Pransa Nāṭuma,(1867),
p.1.

"sedanan niti vasana Itāliya
 nagarin dana loba kara nāv nāṅga
 avudi n golu muhuda mādin siri
 Lakdiva paminī LĀ
 niriṇḍun pera siri sāpatin neka
 supasa n dasadam rakimin visu
 demalu n dān siṭina e Yāpā
 paṭunaṭa goda bāsa LĀ
 gavayan gena yodana ladin yasa
 sārasun kala maharu gālin ṭika
 dinakin magatura pasu karamin
 Kolom̃baṭa päminī LĀ
 diliye n kala komala ruvan nalu
 nalambun hela gatini dilum vana
 avaṭi n sādi kusuma turin rada
 uyanata pivisī LĀ "42

(These dancers who embarked from Italy, a city famous for great gentlemen, in search of money, arrived in Śrī Lankā. They reached Jaffna where the Sinhalese kings righteously administered in the ancient times, but it is now in the hands of Tamils. In bullock carts passing the decorated streets they came to Colombo in a few days. These splendid dancers and their wives with white bodies entered the flowery Royal Park.)

One can notice that it is a verse in four lines. Each line consists of four parts totalling fiftytwo mātrās, and can be divided into two sections. The first section has fortytwo syllabic instants equally divided into three subsidiary lines and each of these is rhymed at the beginning. The second part has only ten mātrās and the ends of these sections form the final rhyme(eliya) of the verse. The period we discuss in this thesis is one which enables and compels the poet to experiment on the metres and the language of poetic literature, and I believe that all research on new Sinhalese poetry has to be done along these two lines. The metres used by our traditional Sinhalese poets and the restrictions on the metres imposed by the classical authorities on prosody became neglected at the hands of these new poets of this period, who were eagerly in search of new avenues to express themselves through the medium of Sinhalese poetry. The language and metres employed by the ancient poets in a restricted way were expanded by the efforts of these poets in the field of new poetry.

Note the employment of a twentyeight mātrā metre in a description of women dancers and the usage of rhymes to enhance the appreciation of the sense.

"sirilaka pāmini mekal-surakal-divapurayen baṭu sē-vesesē
 raṅgakara kara helakal-sulakal-leladi viduli lesē-sasasē
 turaṅgun piṭa ema kal-manakal-siṭa pā puduma rasē-nekasē
 dāka viya nedana vikal-enakal -dakinemi raṅga

melesē-kedesē"

When one considers the overall effects of the controversy on 'sav sat dam' one may be surprised to find that the most famous Sinhalese lay scholar of the day, Baṭuvantudāvē Pandit, abstained from writing poetry. His contributions to the controversy were confined to prose. The other lay scholar, James D'Alwis, who inspired the intelligentsia of that time in the literary works was a counterpart of Baṭuvantudāvē. D'Alwis says in the preface to his 'Contributions to Oriental Literature or the Leisure Hours' that he himself contributed freely to Yatalaba Saṅgarāva.⁴³ Unfortunately when we go through the proceedings of the controversy in Yatalaba Saṅgarāva, we do not find any article written by D'Alwis. But some of the versifications which appeared in the 'Contributions to Oriental Literature' were written under pseudonyms during the controversy. Taking his statement into consideration we can attribute all the refined compositions which appeared under the names of Ām Ak, Akusubāhu and Ati

43. James D'Alwis, Contributions to Oriental Literature or Leisure Hours, (1863) Part i, introduction, p.x.

Adiyara Appuhāmy to D'Alwis.⁴⁴ Why he employed a pseudonym for these verses is a problem still unsolved.

Where Sinhalese poetry is concerned, James D'Alwis belonged to a totally different tradition of poetry from the school of Mīripānnē which we have discussed up to now. We are fortunate to have some of his compositions (but not the contributions he made to the controversy) in his book. D'Alwis was a product of English Christian education and as a result of his knowledge, alienated from the society in which he was brought up, he became a laughing stock at the courts when he tried to translate a statement made by one party in Sinhalese into English. His education had brought him closer to the Colonial governor of the Island,⁴⁵ but it could not allow him to understand a simple statement of his fellowmen in his own country. With great determination he started re-learning Sinhalese in 1845 and became a successful translator in his career. In various places the names of Galātuṃbē Notāris Rālahāmy, Tuḍāvē Paṇḍita and Baṭuvantudāvē have been mentioned as his teachers in the language, but who instructed him in Sinhalese classical texts and poetry is unknown. But when he was a child he was brought up in

44. Compare pp.85-89 of the Contributions to Oriental Literature, Part i, with the Sav Sat Dam Vādaya, edited by H.P.Jayasūriya, pp.26-27, pp.97-98 and p.99.

45. Memoirs and Desultory Writings of the Late James D'Alwis, edited by A.C.Seneviratne, (1939), p.48.

an atmosphere where Sinhalese poetry was well known. His maternal grandfather who was sixtyfive was in habit of reciting verses from Sinhalese texts at night after dinner.⁴⁶ His compositions are of a very sophisticated nature which could only be displayed after gaining a serious mastery of the language.⁴⁷ These works exhibit his skill in handling the classical language and also the talents he gained from his English education. Both these qualifications raised him in the field of the Sinhalese poetry above other contemporary writers. He was a staunch Christian and his 'Hymn to the Trinity' displays his versatility in blending Christian feelings through the Sinhalese language, in which field all the famous Christian writers were hardly able to achieve effective results.

"kenehi eka anaki	na
mulu lova eliya	karamina
apa māv dev	saṇḍina
vaṇḍim bātiyen vāṭī	sāmadina.
"sura lova hāra	porana
minis ves saha duk	gena
apa gālev nāṇa	guna
vaṇḍim devput Jēsu	adarina.

46.op.cit, p.23.

47. 'mama Vyāsakārayen ihala pot kīve nāta.numut 1845 dī nāvata sinhala sāstraya sulaba kara ganṭa paṭan gattemi' Satyālankāraya, 2.7.1879, p.158.

"pirisidu sit devana
 lovata neka siri vadavana
 yali kulunen piruna
 vandim Śuddhātmayan garuvana.

"metun ves ganitat
 ekama yaha nam balavat
 tiyeka dev agapat
 vandim adarin namā mageat". 48

D'Alwis supplied us with the translation of this masterly classic, by A.M.Ferguson.

"To God, at whose creative voice
 The world was form'd and fill'd with light-
 Parent of men! to Thee I pray
 From beaming morn to darkling night.
 "And to THE Son in love I bend,
 Jesus! the wise, the kind, the good;
 Who, leaving Heav'n Our mis'ries bore,
 And for our guilt aton'd with blood.
 "Thee, HOLY SPIRIT! I adore,
 Pervading heav'n and earth with love;
 Whose influence purifies man's heart,
 And fits his soul for realms above.

48. J.D'Alwis, op.cit, p.1.

This is reproduced in his Appendix to Sidat Saṅgarā,
 (1852), p.134.

"In lowliest attitude of love,
 The TRIUNE GOD I bow before;
 As Father, Son and Holy Ghost,
 The one JEHOVAH I adore." ⁴⁹

His only poetic composition published separately was 'Aśvārōhanaya' or 'The Races of 1853 and 1854'.⁵⁰ D'Alwis finished the composition on the races of 1853 but could not complete, though he commenced, a poem on the same subject in 1854. The first part was a description of the horse races in Colombo which took place on 2.9.1853. It was a small piece which consists of thirtyfive stanzas composed in Mālinī metre. We have noted in the previous discussion on the controversy of 'sav sat dam' that borrowed metres from Sanskrit were incorrectly employed by poets due to lack of scholarship and that these metres stood in the way of Sinhalese writers as a barrier to the direct expression of their ideas. But in this great work of D'Alwis, even his enemies could scarcely find any blemish in regard to his constructions. In the descriptions of women in Colombo, of morning, of evening and the gathering of people at the race course, the influence wielded by the classical Sinhalese poems and poets is very recognisable.

49. James D'Alwis, op.cit, p.2, footnote.

50. This appeared in the Contributions to Oriental Literature in 1863, pp.2-11; and was separately printed in 1869 by W.G. Andarayas.

In his unfinished versification on the 'Races of 1854', he created a revolution in the language of the new Sinhalese poetic tradition by employing English, Tamil and Portuguese phrases for the first time. During the controversy the poets of the time were arguing on the correctness of using one or two Tamil, English and Portuguese words which naturally became 'Sinhaliised' in the process. Without a clear knowledge of etymology which was at that time unusual among Sinhalese scholars one could hardly judge the origin of the words 'nari', 'pebaravāri', 'janel' and 'dusin' which were subjected to criticisms. But D'Alwis fearlessly employed whole phrases from foreign languages in his verses.

"I say that is very nice kiyamin balannō
'get back' kiyā lanu dekē ayinē siṭinnō.

"ayyā namakku orutuṭṭu, kiyā yadinnō
'ayyō pasikkidu dorē' kiyamin hiṅgannō

"pārum malē varuvadu kiyamin duvannō.

"nos vi anda per oja prelotrus kiyannō
eli namas ki te kure alogā kiyannō

"bon nos mamus des apusta kiyamin sarannō. 51

51. Lines three, four and five are in Tamil and the meaning is as follows: 3. Sir, give a cent. 4. Oh dear, Sir, I feel hungry. 5. Oh, look. It is raining. The sixth, seventh and eighth lines are in Portuguese and their meaning is obscure now.

Most of these phrases must have been heard by the poet at that time, though it seems to us that he never bothered to record them correctly and accurately.

D'Alwis is to be credited for re-employing the commonest *gī* metre used for narrative in ancient Sinhalese poems, consisting of 9, 11, 9, and 14 *mātrās* in the four feet respectively, disused since the first half of the nineteenth century. The 'problem of a son' (*putra praśnaya*) from Ummagga Jātakaya was narrated in this metre.

The first poet in the history of Sinhalese literature who was proficient in English literature and who critically appreciated English poets was undoubtedly D'Alwis. After reading the 'Traveller' of Oliver Goldsmith, he composed 'A Trip to Mātara', (*Mātarāṭa Giya Gamanak*).⁵² The humane sympathy and gentle irony one finds in the Traveller could hardly be found in this poem. It was merely a description of the trip from Maradāna to Mātara in a train. Sinhalese poetry readers are more or less acquainted with descriptions of a tour from one specified place to another by a messenger in *Sandēśa* poems. In this respect this work shows a great affinity with the descriptions in a *Sandēśa* poem, apart from the messenger

52. James D'Alwis, op.cit, pt.i, pp.49-61.

being the narrator himself and the disappearance of the message and of the person who receives the message. In the description of the morning one can find the usual similies of 'turu biju' the seeds of stars, 'nuba keta' the field of the sky, 'ganañduru uña vena' the forest of bamboo trees of the dark.⁵³ The description of women at Kollupitiya will easily remind a reader of the same details in a Sandēśa poem.⁵⁴

In the description of Agrabōdhi temple at Vāligama he translated a verse of Reginald Heber,⁵⁵ and his profoundness in both languages is clear here.

"In vain with lavish kindness
The gifts of God are strewn;
The heathen, in his blindness,
Bows down to wood and stone".⁵⁶

"suriñdun	visin	dena lada	sāpatin	sapirī
visira	gosin	tibetat	sāma tāna	itirī
kudiṭu	danan	añda bala	bava kara	idirī
nomāñda	bātin	dañda sel	namaditi	hāsirī" ⁵⁷

53.op.cit,p.49.

54.'päṭi hasun vāni tana laya purā siṭī
a ṭi saman paṭiyen bāñdi novū miṭi
siṭi tānin tāna manaram aṅgana kṛṭi
tuṭi vemin pasu kara gos Kollu piṭi'.

55.Reginald Heber, the poet and chief missionary to the East, second Lord Bishop of Calcutta (1783-1826).

56.The English Hymnal, Oxford University Press,(1933),p.709.

57.James D'Alwis, op.cit, p.60.

Like his predecessors and his contemporary Tuḍāvē Pandit, D'Alwis too employed the fiftytwo mātrā metre in the poem for the commemoration of a drowned friend.⁵⁸ This metre appears very seldom in Sinhalese poetry and it seems a difficult task to handle the metre. Except for Gajaman Nōnā, Tuḍāvē Paṇḍita and D'Alwis, the only other instance I have come across of the employment of this metre is in 'Kav Lakara' (1890) written by a disciple of the Mīripānnē school.

The name of D'Alwis could not be omitted from the list of scholars produced by the traditional seats of learning which we discussed in the previous chapter. Though he was self-taught in the language, the scholarship of the school of Mīripānnē and the school of Ratmalāna must have influenced him. Undeniably his versifications exhibit signs of scholarship superior to all the others of the time. But his views on poetry and the standards of poetic evaluation are not very different from those then prevailing among scholars. The Sinhalese poets of that period employed synonyms and homonyms according to the rules of 'Nāmāvaliya' or 'Elu Akārādiya'. The poet has to be adequately equipped with the terms in Nāmāvaliya, not only in composing but also in criticising the

58. James D'Alwis, op.cit, p.64.

compositions of other poets. One of D'Alwis's poet friends described the moon as 'reheṇe' in a verse instead of 'reheṇisuru' and D'Alwis exposed the mistake and cited an example from Kav Mini Maldama of the nineteenth century to establish his correctness.⁵⁹

In criticisms of poetry the exposition of grammatical errors played an inevitable part and it seems that all the poets and the critics of this period believed in the purity in the language according to the grammatical rules. Criticising a composition of Mīripānnē Dhammaratana D'Alwis once wrote that the employment of a case suffix after the nominative case is not allowed in poetry as in 'mē gamhi vasanā minissu haṭa'. Here the poet has used the dative case suffix at the end of the nominative case suffix which is inelegant. D'Alwis exposed this by saying that 'agini yam vibatakāṭa vibatak yodālā nāta kisit satarē'.⁶⁰ When Dhammaratana wrote 'e saṇḍa ... kiyanavā pin dī mesē mā visin', D'Alwis criticised the phrase in this way.

59. 'sisi haṭa reheṇisuru
 misaka reheṇeyi kiviyaṛu
 nokiv bava sīta yuru
 balan Nāmāvaliya potaturu.
 'ohu dedena pinsaru
 reheṇisuru reheṇiya yuru
 yalit danu mema yuru
 tibeyi Kavminimaldamehi saru'.
 James D'Alwis, op.cit, p.81.

60. ibid, p.87.

"kiyanavā mā visin kī basa viyaranata nāta kohet sariyē⁶¹
 etana yeduvot kiyana ladaḍāyi vēya vidudanahaṭada piriye'
 ('kiyanavā mā visin' in this verse is ungrammatical but
 if the poet says 'kiyana ladaḍāyi' then the critical
 reader too will be delighted.)

In this critique it again appears that these critics like the participants in the controversy were confused on the function of language and could not realise the difference between the colloquial idiom and the written idiom in Sinhalese or were reluctant to accept the grammar of the colloquial Sinhalese into verses.

The struggle to defend Buddhism from Christian writings led some businessmen of the new rich class (who were quite lacking in religious inspiration) to set up printing presses in Colombo. They were searching for poetical works to be published in their presses which would provide a source of income. This procedure has enriched the field of Sinhalese poetry and it paved the way for the evolvment of the new poetic literature in Sinhalese.

There were no new poetic creations available to be printed, since the habit of writing poetry for the market was not known among the Sinhalese at this time. It was quite a new venture to print poetry to be read by a large reading public. But in 1864, Lakrivikirana

Press printed 'Janavamsaya' of Sinhabā of Kesellena, in Raygam Kōralē, composed in 1849, an exposition of the caste system of the Sinhalese, which extensively used the prose Janavamsaya of Buddharakkhita of Malvatta temple as a source book; ⁶² there occur similarities in the descriptions between the two. Sinhabā's account of the Karāwe caste is different and new and this suggests to us the prominence of bitter feelings about the caste system in Ceylon at the end of the first half of the nineteenth century. These had become obvious in the controversy on 'sav sat dam', and were evident in the publication of Janavamsaya in 1864.

In 1865, at Lakrivikirana Press, Don Philip De Silva Āpā Appuhāmy published 'Supina Mālaya', ⁶³ a book on dreams in verse. This is said to be the composition of a Pandit called Hisvāllē who translated the ideas from Sanskrit into Sinhalese verses in 1861. Āpā Appuhāmy revised and enlarged the book by adding seven new verses which - altogether makes 92. The clicking of lizards from any direction and the falling of lizards and other small reptiles on to someone's body were also the subject of various superstitious beliefs among the Sinhalese Buddhists,

62. OR 5072; OR 6606(40); OR 6606(41) and OR6606 (180).

63. 'Supina Mālaya' was printed for the fifth time in 1889 by Kornelis Kurē Appuhāmy at Lankābhinava Viśrta Press.

so to the printed book he appended the science of lizards and crows (gauli śāstra and kapuṭu śāstra). This poem indicates the growth of popularity of poetry among the people, and the selection of poetry as a medium to express the results of dreams in the fifties introduced a new subject in the field of Sinhalese poetry.

"nāgunā gaja gava palaturu gal piṭa
gāṭuna asucida tama siyabaṇḍa piṭa
sevunā tama buhunaniyan pahasaṭa
dakinā mesinada yahapati sata haṭa"(verse 31)
(Riding elephants, cows, climbing fruit trees and rocks, touching excrement against the body and having intercourse with an elder sister are good dreams.)

Āpā Appuhāmy's attribution of this work to Hisvāllē Pandit is debatable. A famous Pandit from Hisvālla was the father of Alagiyavanna. If he was meant by Āpā Appuhāmy the creation could not be dated to 1861. The manuscript of Supina Mālaya preserved in the British Museum, gives the name of Alutvalagedara Nākāt Nayidē as its 'writer'. But the word 'liyana' in Sinhalese can both be the author or the copyist of the book. This manuscript has sixtyfive verses,⁶⁴ and we can assume that this 'Supina Mālaya' could be of an earlier poet who lived before 1861, though not as early as 1600, and

64. OR 6613 (61).

the original book may have been subjected to additions and alterations at various hands.

The poetical works written in the early period were not then available to most readers and they were scarce. The owners of the presses realised the value of these books and the money which would accompany the circulation of these books. Lankābhinava Viśrta Press had started by printing 'Prātihārya Śataka' in 1864. All the presses which came into being through enthusiasm for religious propaganda were later diverted to publish the ancient poetical works. At the start the organisers were more careful in selecting the works and it appears that the first publications are based mostly on religion or its affiliated fields.

Saṇḍakiṇḍuru Jātaka Kāvya of Vilgammula thera of the fourteenth century was printed at Lakrivikirana Press in 1866. 'Alav Katāva' based on Ālavaka Sutta of an ancient poet was printed in an unnamed press in Colombo.

Amarasinhagē Karōlis Silva Appuhāmy published 'Andhabhūta Jātakaya' of Talarambē Dhammakkhandha, which was written in 1826, at Sarvagnā śāsanābhivṛddhidāyaka Press. Vidhura Jātakaya was printed in the same press on 8.10.1866. Don Hendrick Gunaratna Appuhāmy published 'Kōla Vidhiya' of Mahatoṭa thera, a book on medicinal decoctions and ointments for the colds, written in 1836, at Lakminipahana

Press. The publisher not only spent money in printing the book but was himself a poet who enlarged the book by adding 'Kōla Rāja' paste(kalkaya) and 'Kōla Sanni' ointment(tela). He revised the whole composition and rewrote the verses in an elegant and skilful manner. It seems he was a better poet than the original author.

"vā pit kōlē palamuva vevuluma una āvililikāsi hāti kākkun
 baḍa pācanayada akkāraṇḍa tādā giniyaṇ melesāṭa ātnan
 samahara aḍu nam piliyaṇ karanuya mē lesa ātnam bāri ēnan
 mīṭama pāvaṭṭā kiriagunada vāltibboṭu vellā katiran"⁶⁵

This can not be considered as a good piece of writing by any means, and it appears to the reader that the ideas Mahatoṭa thera wanted to express were just put into a verse somehow. But Don Hendrick Gunaratna reconstructed the ideas of this verse into two different verses.

"vā pit kipi kōlēṭa mesēmaya
 palamuva āvilili una nāga ēmaya
 akkāraṇ hāti kākkun vīmaya
 baḍin yaṇin giniyaṇ pāhārīmaya.(verse 10).

"mehāma lakunu aḍu nātuvama tibunā
 bāri veyi piliyaṇ noma kara harinā
 pamanak lakunen aḍu vī tibunā
 hāki veyi piliyaṇ noma hāra karanā.(verse 11).

The other publication printed in the year 1866 which could hardly be considered as a book on religion was 'Kovul Saka', a slim volume of eightytwo verses printed in an unnamed press. This was a composition of the previous century which discusses the pangs of separation endured by a youth, and the publisher mentions that it is a very valuable handbook for the student of Elu.⁶⁶

The most outstanding publication that appeared in 1866 was 'Sītāmbraṇaṭaya'(The invisible garment)⁶⁷ of Charles Abrew of Mahadampāgama. This was the first printed contemporary original poetic work of this period we discuss based on a secular tale. In other words Sītāmbraṇaṭaya was the first separately printed original piece of poetry written after 'Janavamsaya' in 1849, in the annals of Sinhalese poetry. The reading public of the new poetical works were from Colombo and it is clear that these works are meant to read aloud to the crowds.

Four thieves of Benares in search of ^{an} easy living approached the king of Rāgaganga city. The proposals of the chief of the four are described dramatically by the poet in the following lines:

66. 'elu vyākaranādī kāvya śāstrayan igena gānmehi vyāvṛta tarunayaṇṭa hastasāra situminiruvanak vāṇiya'.

67. For 'Sitāmbraṇaṭaya'.

"erada vetata yannata mā saha num̃balā
 varada nātuva āvot tuṭu vemi nomulā
 durada nāta yamuva api ehi ekatu velā
 sārada maharajāneni kiyamuva vāṇdalā"(verse 8).
 (I will be pleased if you join with me in going to the
 king. He lives not far away. We will pay obeisance
 together to the king.)

They informed the king of their ability to weave
 a splendidly marvellous garment and all their requirements
 were provided by the king. On an appointed day the king
 and the queen were to be dressed in the new clothes
 and the people of the city flocked together to witness
 them. On the back of a decorated elephant the thieves
 brought the invisible garment and started to dress the
 king and queen. Nobody was able to see the cloth and
 the thieves declared that only those who were born in
 this world legitimately will see it. Everyone who was
 reluctant to accept that his mother had had many men
 besides his father kept silence and pretended to see
 the cloth. After opening the casket, though there
 there was nothing in it the king acted as if there was and
 said that he enjoyed the beauty of the cloth.

"hanika bahā lava maduṭimi karaṇḍu tulā"(verse 84).

(Put it back quickly. I saw it in the casket.)

Thus these four clever thieves allowed the citizens to

watch the king and queen nude on the streets and were appointed to high ranks in the king's retinue.⁶⁸

In 1867, Dāvit Perera printed 'Nanda Mālaya or Dānamiti Mālaya' at Lakminipahana press with one hundred and sixteen verses. Dr. Godakumbure mentions a 'Dānamiti Mālaya' with sixtyeight quatrains,⁶⁹ and the stanza he cites on the common sense of wisdom appears as verse 93 of this book. The printed book is much more complete than the one which is described by Godakumbure, but unfortunately the date mentioned by the poet is doubtful now. His 'hättātunak varusen mē avurudda' is a matter of contention. It is certainly not the present usage but can be Saka era 1773 or Buddhist era 2373 or a century or two prior to this date.⁷⁰ If the Buddhist year is referred to, then it can be dated as 1829. The poet describes the book as a mother to those who wished to be proficient in precepts and as a key to a house.⁷¹

68. See 'The Emperor's New Clothes' in The Fairy Tales and Other Stories by H.C. Andersen, (Oxford Complete Edition), (London, 1914), pp. 89-95.

69. C.E. Godakumbure, Sinhalese Literature, (Colombo), 1955, pp. 219-220 and he shows 1911 as the printed year of the book.

70. If the Buddhist year is 2273 the book has to be dated in 1729. Saka year 1773 will put it in 1851 or if the Saka year 1673 is taken into consideration the book can be dated in 1751.

71. 'dānamitikamaṭa amma keneki mē pota' (verse 5), 'yaturu vāni gedara mē pota ugattot' (verse 116).

We may accept the suggestions made by Dr. Godakumbure on the editing of the book in a later period, and this book, printed in 1867, is the fullest volume we have at hand.

Another collection of didactic verses, namely 'Mōḍa Mālaya' with sixtynine stanzas, was printed in 1867 by Mitṛābhīnaya Samāgama. Most of the verses refer to an anecdote which easily gives the moral teaching on one conversant with that particular folk tale. 'Simhavallī Katāva' of Kavirāja Paṇḍita which narrates the story of the origin of the Sinhalese race was printed in the same year.

The year 1867 is significant in the field of new poetic literature in Sinhalese, since the three available printing presses in Colombo printed and published three newly written poems in that year. The employment of poetry in describing the fields of astrology and diseases became popular among these newly growing poets. H.D. Fernando, a famous astrologer popularly known as Tambiappu Gurunnānsē of Galkissa, wrote an original composition in verse on paediatrics and Abraham Costa published it in Lakminipahana press. The popular belief among the villagers in Ceylon is that the child is subject to various diseases from his birth up to his eighteenth year due to the evil influence of

female demons including the twelve Giris. To cure an invalid child various rituals, ointments, pastes and offerings were prescribed in this book. It was named 'Bāla Graha Śāntiya' and curiously still in Ceylon there are rituals performed on children, like 'Bālagiri', based on the chants and verses of this work.

When compositions on medicine and other affiliated fields are available to the common people like the preceeding work,⁷² the status of the true astrologers and true physicians degenerated and any one who was shrewd enough to learn and read these printed works could easily and tactfully claim the position of an expert in astrology and other medicinal professions. This state of affairs became the subject matter of another original poetical work in 1867. Charles De Abrew Rajapaksa composed 'Veda Urē' with ninetyfour verses. A person who went to Colombo approached a recognised physician and in a few days read some books and prescriptions. Thus he automatically reached the plane of a physician and was known as 'veda āraci' in a village, though he hardly had any knowledge of medicine

72. Āpā Appuhāmy saha Samāgama printed and published the following texts on eastern medicine;
 Aṣṭa Parikṣāva, Lakrivikirana Press, 1867,
 Trayōdaśa Śannipāta Lakṣaṇaya Lakrivikirana Press, 1867,
 Vaidyālamkāraya Lakrivikirana Press, 1867,
 Yōgamuktāvaliya Lankābhinavaviśṭa, 1867,
 Śataślōkaya, 1862,
 Sarasavi Nighanduva, 1865.

or diseases and engaged in experiments with the innocent lives of foolish villagers. The pseudo-astrologers also were subjected to criticism in this poem. A man who had no idea of the simple elements of astrology was in the habit of recommending rituals to cure invalids and he too was ridiculed by the poet.⁷³

In 1867, another original piece of poetical writing, namely 'Visama Taruni' from the pen of D.W.Gunaratnayaka, appeared at Lakrivikirana Press. It was subtitled the 'story of Annie' who made her husband blind through lust for a paramour. It looks like an actual happening of the time in Colombo. Annie is a European girl or a Burgher, who in her sixteenth year was described by the poet as a lady who was proficient in Sinhalese, Dutch, English, writing, playing instruments and singing.

"Sinhala lansi ingrisiyada igenā
nima la atin pirisidu lesa liyanā
viyo la ga gā gī sinduda kiyanā
koma la laṇḍun saha euyan kelinā"(verse 4).

The poet in describing a modern girl in the fashionable new society was forced to imitate the similies of the older Sinhalese poets by saying her forehead is like the crescent moon, her eye brows are like the rainbow.

73. 'dukapat diliṇḍu ara gāhānun ravaṭālā
sāka nāt Nilāṅga Rakusē āriyot āmbalā', verse 85.

"sobaman äge helavan paṭu nalalata aḍa saṇḍaṭā
vadimin diya nāṅgu in iṇḍudunu vāni bāma sumuṭā"(verse9)

Justinus, a son of a wealthy administrator, fell in love with this girl, though the parents were desperately against it. He threatened to leave the country, but the parents allowed him to marry her as he was their only son. In no time she became friendly with a paramour, named Abaran (Abraham). Love letters were exchanged between the two. Annie went to Nuvaraeliya for rest and was joined by the lover without the knowledge of the husband, and they were living together. She became pregnant. Then the husband visited her at Nuvaraeliya. There she played a trick by giving him a broken needle to fix a thread. Unfortunately he could not, as there was no hole in the needle. She suggested a weakness in his eyes, got an ointment from the native physician and rubbed it against the eyes of her husband, mixing some pieces of glass into it. He became blind. Annie got some money from the father -in- law and embarked for France in a ship from Trincomalee.

Kāvya Śēkharaya of the fifteenth century which described a woman of the same calibre who lived with a paramour without the knowledge of her husband has sometimes influenced this poet in dealing with the false sickness and tactics of the woman. The poet may

have heard of actual events of this kind in Colombo and Nuvaraeliya and composed the poem to extol the popular conception of women as 'unfaithful' among the Sinhalese people. The poem consists of a hundred and fifty verses. One important point clearly indicated in this work is - that the poets of this new revivalistic period considered actual social events to be suitable for the subject matter of a poem. Though the employment of social occurrences and contemporary events as the subject matter of a poem had been gradually introduced by the poets of the earlier nineteenth century, including Mīripānnē Dhammaratana, it was considerably expanded by the poets of the new literary revival.

Another folk tale was versified by the author of 'Sītāmbraṇaṭaya' and 'Veda Urē', introducing modern feelings on the caste system in 1867. It was 'Tirihan Polla' (The staff of youth). Four brothers of the Beravā caste, expecting respect from society, got an 'Appuhāmy' of Govigama caste as their servant, and by the passage of time the four sisters of the Beravā family became pregnant because of the Appuhāmy. Realising the results Appuhāmy fled home. The four Beravā brothers came in search of him. As they were arriving he mercilessly hit his older sister and took her away. In a few minutes appeared a young damsel, who had been hiding inside, and Appuhāmy

said that the pole had restored her youth. The brothers then felt greatly in need of that pole and Appuhāmy presented them with it. The other Beravās in the village then requested these brothers to use the pole on them.

— Thus Appuhāmy tactfully killed the whole community of Beravā people and lived with their women. In these one hundred and two verses what the poet was expressing was the unchangeability of one's caste by one's wealth. To prove his point he cited a tale from Hitōpadēśa, which narrates the story of a jackal who felt himself to be as great as a lion but succumbed to death.

'Hasun Kav Mālāva', published by Don Karolis, was an interesting poem and I believe the first to narrate a genuine love story. It tells of the unfaithfulness of a young girl to her fiance in versified letters. It was

— written to show the raw feelings of disgust created by the faithlessness of the girl after eight months and twentyseven days. The young man appears to be a poet from Colombo, who was asked to send some books to the girl by her father. This exchanging of books turned into a love affair with the consent of the parents, but at last she deserted him and married another man. The poet was shocked to hear the news and transferred his letters and her letters into a narration of the evolution of a love affair. It looks like a true incident, and before

finishing his poem he said that he has bunches of letters sent by the girl and if she is rude to the poet in the future he will expose her whole character. The employment of a type of 'love separation' could be seen in the poetical works of the early nineteenth century. But a separation of a very genuine and a personal nature such as this was not common in those works.

Thus the year 1867 could be considered as a significant year in the development of new poetical tradition in Sinhalese. Five original poetical works were printed in this year, namely 'Tirihan Polla' and 'Veda Urē' of C.De Abrew Rajapaksa, 'Bāla Graha Śāntiya' of H.D.Fernando, 'Visama Taruni' of D.W.Gunaratnayaka and 'Hasun Kav Mālāva' of an unknown poet. The subject matter was often drawn from real social events and personal experiences. They were not recognised as the masters of language; their compositions exhibit their talents in versification, but not in the correct skilful employment of the language which will enhance the beauty of poetry. They were not proficient in the language as the poets of the fifteenth century were. But these works created an interest in (the) ordinary people for reading poetry and listening to poems in the modern age.

The lack of newly written poems for the market with the languishing religious spirit created problems for the new presses in Colombo. But there was a scattered store

of poetical works in personal collections of palm leaf manuscripts which enabled them to solve this problem. In 1869, at Sarvagña Śāsanābhivṛddhidāyaka Press, were printed 'Padamānavaka Jātakaya', 'Saddanta Hālla' or Chaddanta Jātaka', 'Trividha Ratna Katāva',⁷⁴ which praises the faith of a woman in Buddha when she is tortured, 'Padmāvatī Katāva',⁷⁵ a story which describes 'an account of the results of the actions of a virtuous woman' (both these taken from Saddharmāṅkārāya,⁷⁶ and the latter poem written in 1693 by the grandson of Śrēṣṭha Paṭirāga of Algama Rākava in Uḍu Kōralē) and 'Devidat Katāva' of Karagahagedara Vanijasūriya mudiyansē, written in 1792⁷⁷ with an alternative title 'Dēvadatta Varunē Kavi Baṇa Pota', an exposition of the enmity of Dēvadatta for the Aspiring One. These five works are religious, but were written in Kandyan times. Two were Jātaka tales,

74. OR 6603 (207).

75. OR 6603 (113), OR 6603 (125), OR 6604 (139), OR 6604 (209), OR 6611 (83).

76. Saddharmāṅkārāya, edited by K. Sārānanda, Saraṇasthavira Vastuva, pp. 116-123. Padmāvatī Vastuva, pp. 161-177.

77. OR 6604 (170) entitled 'Sērivāṇija Jātaka Kavi Pota' in the colophon gives two different dates, 1692 and 1792 respectively. Dr. Godakumbure and Dr. Sannasgala treated it as 1692.

and another, 'Dēvadatta Varunē', also describes mainly the enmity at the time of 'Sērivāṇija Jātaka'; the other two compositions deal with the effective results of Buddhism. Vanijasūriya Mudiyaṇsē's theory 'kaviyen tibunat daham dahammaya' (no harm in versifying the discourses of Buddha) may have affected the feelings of the owners of printing presses who were seeking for religious poems to be published. Another poem, 'Perakadōru Haṭana', was printed in an unnamed press in this year, which describes the malpractices of a shrewd proctor of Mātara, written on 16.3.1838 with one hundred and fifteen verses. These poetical works, whether connected with Buddhist religious stories or with social events, undoubtedly increased the numbers of the reading public in this period.

The only original piece of poetical writing printed in 1869 was 'Sidat Vata', the biography of Valāṇē Siddhattha by Don Philip De Silva Āpā Appuhāmy. It exhibits an affinity with the teachings of traditional poets. His great desire was to imitate the way followed by the ancient classical poets, though he was not able to fulfil his wishes. Like the three poets of the Muvadev Dā, Sasa Dā and Kusa Dā of the 12 th and 13 th centuries, Āpā Appuhāmy too says that he will illustrate the full story of the poem in the future like the full moon which

grows to that state from the crescent of the first day after the new moon.

" peraḍa masa pera dina
 abinava saṇḍa se pāmanina
 dakvā eyati guna
 kiyam yali pun saṇḍa se vitarana" (verse 4)

Though the poet preferred to imitate the classical way of Sinhalese poetry he was ill equipped for the purpose. His language and standard of grammar can be exemplified with the following two sentences.

"etumaṭa velā siyādura" (verse 18).

The combination of 'siya' with 'āduru' is meaningless and useless. He wanted to say 'he became his teacher'.

"edam dānagaṇḍa saṇḍa satara magadamā
 uganvami duhuna haṭa eyati situ yomā" (verse 37).

'uganvami' of the first person goes with the third person subject 'eyati'. He found himself in need of a rhyme without suitable words in his hands and in the third line adds 'ma' at the end of a word just to equalise the lines.

The birth and studies of Siddhattha were described in the first canto with twentyfour verses, and this is followed by a bodily description of the priest in the second canto which runs up to verse thirtyfive. Thus this canto which describes the death of the priest has only eleven verses and can not be considered as a canto

or a 'sarga' of a kāvya according to the prescribed rules. Why he described these sections as sargas is not known, and the division is unscientifically carried out by the poet. It is not a mahākāvya though he divided the poem into three cantos.

Undoubtedly Valānē Siddhattha was the great master of scholarship at that time. But the poet has described his scholarship by employing a device which was utterly out of place. The poet sincerely wanted to extol his scholarship, but unfortunately the inappropriateness of the statements belittles the greatness of Siddhattha. Valānē was on his sickbed dying and his disciples flocked together at the temple. Realising that it was his last moments they started to chant from the Discourses of Buddha. It was a popular Sutta, which would help the deceased to gain a higher place of rebirth.

"tepalu bas piligena
 ek saṅga namak kuhulina
 Satipaṭṭhan suturena
 dham desanaṭṭha paṭṭhan gattāna. (verse 80)

" edigaṭṭha nāmada gena
 asanā kalaṭṭha satuṭṭina
 desanā dam pelena
 ekakurak vāradī kiyā duna (verse 81)

"yalidu elesama	hiṇḍa
asanā kala daham	kaṇḍa
kurak vāradunu	saṇḍa
kiyā dī sayanin nāṅgī	soṇḍa.(verse 82).

Was not the great master an unfortunate human being if he could not teach his disciples to chant even the most popular Sūtra correctly (to be heard by him) on his death bed after thirty years of excessive labour and devotion in the field of traditional learning? The poet I believe was in need to show the exemplary character of Valānē as a teacher, but his materials were employed at a wrong place and the backlash is clearly visible to the intelligent reader.

With the printing of these poetical compositions we can note the development of the essential features for the spreading of a commercial venture: not only the writers of poetry, the readers of poetry, the printers of poetry, but also the publishers or the people who spent the money to publish the books. It seems that the critic was not a necessary feature at that time since most of the publications had been written during the last three centuries and they could hardly be considered as new writings. Previously new writings had been subjected to criticisms by the poets of rival traditions of scholarship as we have previously noted. Only a handful of new poetical writings appeared at this time and as these writers did not belong directly to the

scholarly traditions of learning there was no competition among them.

1870 was a year in which a large number of printed poems appeared. 'Mahākaṇha Jātakaya'⁷⁸ and 'Magādēva Jātakaya' (Makhādēva Jātakaya),⁷⁹ two Jātaka tales, were published by Simon Perera. The name of the author of Mahākaṇha Jātakaya does not appear in the printed version, which is not to be found in any library in Ceylon.⁸⁰ James D'Alwis in his introduction to Sidat Saṅgarā mentions a Mahākaṇha Jātaka Kāvya by David De Saram, the Mudliar of Gaṅgabodā Pattuva, Mātara, written in 1820, and D'Alwis describes the poem in 1852 as a 'work which is much esteemed amongst us'.⁸¹ Hugh Nevill who discussed the work at the end of the century was unaware of the author and the period of the work.⁸² The definiteness in the statement of D'Alwis, throws some light on the author of the poem. There exists no other versifications of Mahākaṇha Jātakaya in Ceylon; so this book could be ascribed to David De Saram and the contents of the book will confirm

78.OR 6604 (17), OR 6604 (91).

79.OR 6604 (224), OR 6604 (225).

80.Dr. P.B.J.Hevavasam, in his thesis on the Matara poetry, used the palm leaf manuscript of Jayamaha Vihāraya, Mātara, and has not seen the printed work.

81.James D'Alwis, op.cit, p.ccxxxvii.

82.Hugh Nevill, Sinhalese Verse, Part i, edited by P.E.P. Deraniyagala, (1954), p.9.

the authorship. Śakra the king of the gods, in disguise of a hunter with Mātali in the apparition of a groaning hound reached the city of Benares to admonish the people on the earth about the growing rate of crime and sin. After eating a collection of food from the whole of Benares, the hungry dog could still not be satisfied unless he was allowed to eat all those who engaged in crimes. The people including the king wanted to have a clear idea of these crimes, and they were described by Śakra. All sorts of criminals and sinners were included in the list of intended victims of the furious dog, such as the unrighteous priests who have spouses and children, who act as farmers and cultivators, who accumulate wealth and who are engaged in astrological and medicinal capacities. Like the perturbed Śakra in the Jātaka tale, in 1820, De Saram who erected the three storeyed temple, Jētavanārāmaya, at Goḍapiṭṭiya, Akurāssa, and was the patron of the religious festival in the river Nilvalā, as narrated in Gangārōhaṇa Varṇanāva, one verse of which gave birth to the controversy on 'sav sat dam', may have expected a community of bhikkhus who are pure around him, and after realising the degradation of religious preachers he might have selected this Jātaka tale for versification because he could easily and indirectly make the priests of the day to realise what the Buddha has expected from them.

Thus Mahākāṇha Jātakaya of Saram Mudliar may have been published in 1870 with the intention of criticising the existing bhikkhu society in Ceylon who were struggling against each other for the supremacy of their respective sects. This poem belonging to the past, a composition of a well known administrator and a Buddhist devotee, might have brought more effective results on the subject during the controversies on righteousness, than a newly composed critique by a modern hand.

Makhādēva Jātakaya is an interesting poem based on the story which was the subject of the oldest surviving Sinhalese poem in the twelfth century. Even then the poem under discussion did not overlap the earlier poem, Muvadev Dā, in any way. Both writers made use only of the 'previous story' (atīta katāva) but this one narrates only the events which preceded the abdication of the king, after finding a grey hair on his head. The prince Makhādēva who was born to be the king of Mithilā refused first kingship and then marriage. His advice on kingship and marriage to the persuading ministers were set out in detail in the new Makhādēva Jātaka poem. On refusing the kingship he illustrated the immoral lives of kings drawn from Buddhist stories. When the prince was consulted by the ministers on marriage he described the bad qualities of women and cited a tale where the mother of two sons was subjected

to humiliation by a daughter-in-law. The prince preached to the ministers on the features of the seven types of wife of this world according to Buddhist teachings. The poet finishes his poem in one hundred and seventy four verses, forming a detailed expansion of a situation in the chain of events which led to the king's leaving the palace. One will hardly find the actual story of Makhādēva in this work, but only the advice of Makhādēva to the ministers on kingship and wives. The composition can not be dated. It can be included in a list of works which deal with religious advice.

Two other works connected with religion were printed in 1870. 'Dēvadūtē', a slim volume of fortyfour verses, narrates the atrocities in the one hundred and thirtysix hells underneath the earth, and is based on Devadūta Sutta.⁸³ The existence of several versions of Dēvadūtē in a completer form than the printed one, at the British Museum, ⁸⁴ proves that the unscholarly money-searching publisher has just rushed through the first version which came to his hands in manuscript form.

Saradiyel Perera Appuhāmy published 'Kālani Hālla' in 1870, which narrates the greatness of a sacred site of Buddhists in Ceylon, in fiftysix verses.

83.OR 6599 (24).

84.OR 6604 (216), OR 6603 (125), OR 6604 (96), OR 6604 (147).

The Nāḍagama, first indigenous form of drama in Ceylon, was introduced into Sinhalese by Pilippu Siññō, a Roman Catholic from Colombo, at the dawn of the century along the lines of Tamil Nāṭakam. With music and dancing inhibited by the religion, this became the most popular medium of mass entertainment in Ceylon. The popularity of Nāḍagam demanded many stories from the Sinhalese literature which it could not supply. Religious stories including Jātaka tales were not regarded as suitable for dramatisation for fear of bad influence of gods. Most of the Nāḍagam writers were Christians and even the few Buddhist writers were reluctant to draw stories for dramatisation from religious texts.⁸⁵ Tamil and European stories came into the hands of these playwrights and dramatists. Popular stories other than religious stories became the subject matter of the earlier Nāḍagam plays and these stories were versified for the benefit of those who did not see the play and to help to recall the play for those who did see it. In 1870, three books of this kind were printed. 'Dinatarā Katāva', a Tamil story which describes the tactful ways of winning the heart of a woman, was printed at Sarvagña Śāsanābhivṛddhi-dāyaka Press. 'Sulāmbāvatī Katāva' narrates the tale of a

85. Only the Kusa Jātaka and Vessantara Jātaka were dramatised during the 19th century.

queen who slept with a deformed man in spite of the king. The shrewdness of a woman who stops a legal heir to the throne becoming king is described in 'Kāpiri Kumārayāgē Katāva'. Realising the disadvantages of other people printing the stories which form a Nāḍagama, D.P.D.Alwis, a pupil of Pilippu Siññō, in 1870 published 'Āhālēpola Nāḍagama' or 'Simhalē Nāḍagama', the first Sinhalese Nāḍagam script of Pilippu Siññō.⁸⁶ The growing popularity of this mass entertainment may have encouraged Simon Perera, a publisher, to print a collection of verses which accompany a folk dance among the damsels in villages, namely 'Kalagedi Mālaya'. These verses contain sixteen mātrās with four caesural pauses. This is the Padaka or Peda metre of the Gaja Chandasa. The appended 'Abhinava Kalagedi Mālaya' must have been a poor imitation by a contemporary hand.

'Āṇḍi Mālē', a peculiar poem, misinterpreted by scholars through superficial reading,⁸⁷ was printed in this same year, by Pedrick Kurē Appuhāmy. According to the colophon the poet is ~~the~~ great nephew of Galganayē priest and the grandson of Yālēgoḍa, the prime minister of king Senarat of Kandy and the son of a minister Yāpā of Āmbanvila.

86. This printed copy is not known to Dr.E.R.Saraccandra or to Vilmot P.Vijayatunga, the pioneer writers of Sinhalese drama in Ceylon.

87. Dr.P.B.Sannasgala thought that it was an attack on Hinduism after reading a manuscript. (Simhala Sāhitya Vamśaya, 1961, pp.327-328.)

This is an older poetical work, first of its kind, which criticises the contemporary political situation. The connections of the poet with aristocratic political circles might have inspired him to write on the political crisis which arose after the extinction of Sinhalese kings in 1739. His main purpose in the book was to argue against the appointment of a son of a queen 'Pāñḍi' for the throne in Ceylon. The poet employed the terms Pāñḍi and Āñḍi synonymously, which explains the name of the work.

At the beginning of the poem he criticises the people who were converted to the 'devil rituals', most probably Christianity, and following on from that he approaches the main intention of his poem.

"melakdiva Sinhala rajun misa āñḍiyek raja kam kalet nāta"
(Only Sinhalese kings have ruled this Island and not a miserable beggar.)

The Sinhalese Buddhists who had lost their identity by giving up religion were then making attempts (he says) to destroy still further their existing national identity as Sinhalese by selecting kings from other countries. This was severely criticised by the poet. The term he used for contemporary ministers was 'dog' as in 'Kīravāllā kiyana ballā '. If one can trace the time of the prime minister

Kuruppu ⁸⁸ then we shall be in a position to give the actual date of the composition.

Another versification on thirty hours, ⁸⁹ twelve months and seven days entitled 'Dolos Māsē Saha Tispāyet Sivupada Pota' was printed in 1870 by an unnamed publisher. This may be a contemporary work. The technique employed by the poet is interesting and was new in the field of Sinhalese poetry. He appealed to a woman to visit him separately in the thirty hours of the seven days. This was done as a device for easy memorisation. She comes to the poet and becomes pregnant and the poet gets the chance the names of twelve months during and after her pregnancy.

This is a very poor versification indeed; but in the year 1870, the Royal visit from England gave a chance to the poets to exhibit their lost creative abilities in praise of Sinhalese kings. The visit of Prince Alfred, Duke of Edinburgh, on 30.3.1870, ⁹⁰ inspired the poets to exploit the avenues of their forefathers. 'Ingirisi Mālaya' of Simon De Silva is a lost composition ⁹¹ on

88. maKUṭṭa gaRUḍa soPna naPUru bāṇḍunu satara ganehi māṇḍē
akuruvalin namak labapu parasiṇḍu agamātiṇḍu saṇḍē. (52).

89. According to Sinhalese calculations 60 minutes is equal to 2 1/2 hours. 30 such hours is therefore equal to 12 modern hours.

90. John Capper, The Duke of Edinburgh in Ceylon, (1871), London.

91. In the introduction to Kumārōdaya Varnanāva, he mentioned this work as 'Sēdana Mālaya' (Garland to the Whitemen).

the Royal visit but we have another work of thirtyfive verses entitled 'Albred Kumārayāṭa Hādū Kavi', ⁹² an unprinted palm leaf manuscript by an unknown author. The poets who lived in Ceylon in the early period described the kings and their lives in India in accordance with the descriptions of Indian Sanskrit poems. Following their footsteps this poet too described the imaginary city of London. The inefficiency of the author is obvious in his language and description of events, and it appears to the reader that he made this attempt through sheer loyal inspiration derived by witnessing a prince of the Royal family.

The interests displayed by the printing presses, publishers and writers seems to ^{have} ~~be~~ virtually lost after 1870. In the next five years only two printed works came to the hands of Sinhalese readers. These two original works dealt with contemporary social events, which aroused the feelings of the writers. The inundation of the river Kālaṇi in the month of September 1872 was described in fiftythree verses by Simon D'Silva, chief clerk and interpreter to the Bench of Magistrates at the Municipal Council, Colombo, in 'Gam Vatura'. His position in the field of scholarship as a poet and his main intention in the composition is clearly indicated in the introduction.

'mēvā vyākaraṇa alamkāraḍiyeṇ paṇḍita gōcara novana namut
sahamulinma mēvāyin prakṛta vennē vunā vū kāraṇāmaya'.

(Though these statements are ungrammatical and unpoetical
all these descriptions were actual happenings.)

Obscurity in the language is evident everywhere. Sometimes
he employed old terms like 'vaharē'(rain) with modern
words like 'hirihāraya' (instead of hirihāraya).

The names of administrators including the governor
Gregory (Girigōri), Christian priests and wealthy
Christians were eulogised in this poem for assisting
the flood victims of Raygam Pattuva, Gaṅgaboḍa Pattuva
of Siyanā Kōralē and Salpiṭi Kōralē. The poet was
undoubtedly a Christian, and at the end of the poem
he prays the readers to revere the Saviour.

'Kumārōḍaya Varṇanāva' of Simon De Silva (a different
one from the author of Gam Vatura we just mentioned),⁹³
a narration of the honours paid to the Prince of Wales
on the occasion of his visit to Ceylon in 1875, was
printed in 1876. This is a more clever composition than
'Gam Vatura' of the other Simon D'Silva. He imitated
the similes of the traditional poets in descriptions.

"lakasara dini piyumev sāma mātivaru

dinakara kumarun rāsa māda saru" (verse 22).

93. There were four Simon De Silvas who enriched the
literature of Ceylon, three in the 19 th century
and another Christian priest in the 20 th century.
Besides the authors of Gam Vatura and Kumārōḍaya
Varṇanāva, there was an uncle of Vaskaḍuvē nāyaka therā.

(The lotus-like ministers of the pond of Lankā were delighted after seeing the Prince like the sun.)

However, the accurate number of mātrā in a specified metre was ignored by the poet, maybe due to a lack of proficiency in handling the words.

'raṭin toṭin ā sen māda lassena
 siṭin piṭin yana sereppu lā gena
 hiṭin hiṭin gā appulā bō dena
 vaṭin piṭin giyō uḍa pāna pāna' (verse 47).

These four lines contain sixteen, sixteen, seventeen and fifteen matras respectively, which is inaccurate and hard to read rhythmically.

Once he declares his inability to draw a sketch of the ceremony on the moon as his hands are too short to reach there.⁹⁴ Unfortunately he was not only unable to draw the picture of the decorations on the moon but he could not do so properly even in writing on the paper which was in his hands. The book contains one hundred and eighty verses and was dedicated to Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala nāyaka thera, the principal of Vidyodaya Pirivena.

With the assistance of the foregoing discussion we can see how the new poetic tradition in the Sinhalese literature involving printers, writers and publishers came into existence. Some presses were added to the

94. naṇḍē sitin emaṅgul maḍuvaṭa giya ē varunē - mama
 sandē aṇḍimi ata diga nāti sandā misa anē. (verse 79).

number of presses already available in the Island by economically interested businessmen. With the gradually languishing interest in printing and publishing religious writings all these presses were desperately in search of new writings for publishing. From 1864 up to 1875, only a handful of original poetic creations appeared through these presses. 'Pransa Nr̥tya Kāvya', 'Aśvārōhaṇa Varṇanāva', 'Sītāmbrapaṭaya', 'Veda Urē', 'Visama Taruni', 'Tirihan Polla', 'Hasun Kav Mālāva', 'Sidat Vata', 'Gam Vatura' and 'Kumārōdaya Varṇanāva' were those original new writings. One interesting point here to note is that all these compilations are the creations of lay scholars. They dealt with personal experiences and social events of contemporary life as the subject matter of their poetry. Except Tuḍāvē Pandit and Baṭuvantuḍāvē Pandit, none of the writers of the time had any academic achievements with their poetic talents, so that their standards of learning gave them ample opportunity and freedom, in employing the language and in poetical descriptions, to neglect the rigid forms and rules of the early poets. The two scholar poets just mentioned were experimenting in the medium of poetry to express their ideas and were consciously successful in exploring new avenues in poetic diction and metre in Sinhalese poetry. These experiments encouraged all the other writers of the period to further their achievements in these fields.

Since their scholarship in the field of criticism was insignificant they had no original views on poetry and they were reluctant to exhibit their rivalry with each other in writing poetry. They always accepted their ignorance in the learned fields and left scholars to grumble over these matters. With this freedom they have expanded the existing limitations in the field of new Sinhalese poetry.

A considerable number of older poetical works were printed on all these presses as we have discussed in the preceding pages. Except for 'Janavamsaya' on the Sinhalese caste system, 'Supinamālaya' on superstitious beliefs, 'Kōla Vidhiya' on medicine, 'Āṇḍi Māle' on a political theme, 'Kovul Saka' on an erotical subject, 'Nanda Mālaya' and 'Mōḍa Mālaya' on morals and 'Simhavallī Katāva' on the origin of the Sinhalese race, all the others were associated with Buddhist literature. 'Saṇḍakiṇḍuru, Andhabhūta, Vidhura, Padamānavaka, Chaddanta, Mahākappa, Magādēva and Sērivāṇija Jātakas narrate the tales of the past lives of Lord Buddha. 'Alav Katāva' and 'Prātihārya Śataka' deal with incidents which occurred in the life of the Master. 'Trividha Ratna Katāva' and 'Padmāvati Katāva' reveal the benefit of taking refuge in the Master, His teachings and His disciples. 'Dēvadūtē' gives tragic descriptions of the sufferings in the hells

of those who discarded His teachings. 'Kālaṇi Hālla' describes the sacred site at Kālaṇiya where Lord Buddha trod during his life time. These publications, one can attribute to a developed stage of the religious struggle. But this time it was not really a war to gain the lost interests of the Buddhists, but an attempt to seek money by the available presses. Indirectly, however, it developed a reading public who could appreciate the new literary revival. The compositions printed by these presses must have definitely created and expanded a new reading public for printed poetry. Thus in 1875, when the traditional learning of the country culminated with the establishment of two great traditional educational seats at Māligākanda (1874) and Pāliyagoḍa (1875), only favourable encouragement was expected from these new traditional scholars for the new poetical tradition in the Sinhalese language.

Chapter six

DEVELOPMENT OF THE NEW POETICAL TRADITION IN SINHALESE (1875 - 1906)

The few printed poetic creations which we discussed in the last chapter were certainly not the outcome of academic inspiration derived from the traditional seats of learning belonging to the three sects of Buddhism. The new original poetry was written not by bhikkhus who had received their education at these institutions but by laymen. Since the elements of traditional learning reached their highest point in 1875, after the establishment of the Vidyodaya and Vidyāḷankāra pirivenas, one might ^{have} tend to believe that this would have massively enriched the new poetic tradition in Sinhalese literature. But the unfavourable treatment of Sinhalese poetry at the hands of these scholars gave the opportunity to a new group of writers in the field of Sinhalese poetry, to exhibit their talents. Before discussing the new developments in Sinhalese poetry I will here make attempts to analyse the traditional attitude of the scholars, mainly of the bhikkhus of the three sects and their branches, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Vāḷiviṭṭa Saranankara Sangharāja, the pioneer of the new literary revival of the eighteenth century, is claimed

by some scholars as an authoritative writer on Sanskrit poetical works,¹ and is traditionally considered as a composer of Pali poems,² but he shows no sign of any acquaintance with Sinhalese poetry. Saranankara instructed Attaragama Bandāra in Pali prosody.³ Some of his disciples, it is recorded in his biography, had been learning prosody,⁴ but we can not certainly say if this means Sinhalese poetry. But Rājaguru Bandāra, the acclaimed master from the Malvatta monastery, the originator of the scholarly pupillary succession in the Siamese sect, after leaving robes, versified in Sinhalese two primary educational texts, namely 'Vadan Kavi Pota' and 'Ganadevi Hālla' or 'Ganapati Yādinna', which were predominantly used in the Sinhalese educational system of the Island even in the twentieth century, before the new educational development

-
1. W.F.Gunawardhana mentions his knowledge of Mēghadūta and Raghu Vamśa. But his biography says that Vāliiviṭṭa delivered a sermon to a Brahmin, who could understand only Sanskrit, in Sinhalese and Pali. *Āyittāliyaddē*, op.cit. p.8.
 2. Sangharāja Sādhū Cariyāva says that 'Muniguna Alamkāraya' is a composition of Saranankara. (p.11). In the months of Durutu and Vesak in 1739, when Vijayaṛājasimha, the king of Kandy, visited the temple of Tooth Relic for offerings, he composed two Daladā Aṣṭaka in Pali, copies of which can be read at the British Museum, but not in Ceylon. OR 6601 (15).
 3. 'sangharājōttama sāmīngen vyākaraṇa Pālichandas igena' idem, p.35.
 4. 'līm kīm banadaham chandas nighaṇḍu vyākaraṇa uganimin' is said when describing Mādavela Ānanda thera. ibid, p.17.

which appeared after Independence. He was named 'Mahākavi' (a great poet) by his disciples,⁵ and it is said that his composition 'Vṛttāvatāraya' is associated with poetical instruction.⁶ Furthermore he imparted knowledge on Pali and rhetoric, to the pupils of Malvatta monastery.⁷ But we have no Sinhalese poetical writing which can be attributed to him when he was a priest of the Siamese sect.

The closest disciples of Saranankara followed the same pattern of ideas in regard to Sinhalese and Pali poetry. Tibbaṭuvāvē Siddhārtha Buddharakkhita versified the history of Ceylon from the time of Parākramabahu iv, to the time of Kīrti Śrī Rājasimha, in Pali and it is designated as the third part of 'Cūla Vamsa'. One of his primary Pali compositions entitled 'Daladā Aṣṭakaya' where he pays homage to the Tooth Relic at Kandy is preserved in the British Museum.⁸ Mādavela Ānanda, who later became the mahānāyaka of Malvatta, when he was a novice, in 1739, wrote a 'Śrī Dantadhātu aṣṭakaya' in

5. At the end of Buddharāja Aṣṭakaya, the statement in hybrid Pali reads thus; 'Baṇḍārarājagurūnam mahākavissa sissatrajena racitam', OR 6601 (11).

6. 'chandas śabda śāstra upakāra vū ... Vṛttāvatāraya yana abhinava prakarana upadavā...' Āyittāliyaddē, op.cit. p. 36.

7. 'Pāli pot kavyālamkāra pot asvamin...' ibid p.36.

8. OR 6601 (15).

Pali when the king of Kandy was worshipping the Tooth Relic.⁹ Ginigatpiṭṭiyē Sangharakkhita, who was in close association with the Sangharāja, was the only priest of the eighteenth century who versified in Sinhalese.

In the British Museum we have ten silō verses written by 'Ginigatpiṭṭiyē Ganavālin' in Sinhalese for the purpose of worshipping the Tooth Relic.¹⁰ These are the same verses which occur in his poetical work, entitled 'Teruvan Mālā' or 'Tiratna Mālā Śatakaya', under the heading 'Daladā Vandana' (offerings to the Tooth). This work was written when he was a novice under Saranankara.¹¹ The insertion of these verses proves that they were written not later than the 'Teruvan Mālā', and certainly during the period of his noviceship.¹² The novice is not taken seriously in the order of bhikkhus, and we find that the Sinhalese versifications of Sangharakkhita appeared only when he was not a fully pledged bhikkhu.

9. OR 6601 (15).

10. 'Ginigatpiṭṭiyē ganavālin visin Śrī dantadhātūn vahansēṭa namaskāra karana piṇisa abhinava kiyā dākvū elu silōyi'
OR 6601 (12).

11. 'pada sevana vādī sad sat saṇḍās dam maṇḍak dat
atavāsi heranek mok set labamvayi sitin yut'
Ginigatpiṭṭiyē Sangharakkhita, Teruvan Mālā, (1965) unpaginated.

12. With this evidence we can totally reject the interpretation of the terms 'Ganavoli' and 'Ganavali' by the Sinhalese scholars, as the leader of a bhikkhu community.
See, Mādauyangoda Vimalakīrti, Mātara Sāhitya Yugaya, (1953) p. 10.

Siṭṭināmaluvē Dhammajoti and Vēhāllē Dhammadinna, the founders of the bhikkhu tradition and the pupillary succession in the Low- country, were no writers of poetry in either language. But all the efforts made by the next generation of bhikkhus for the revival of Sinhalese poetry are undoubtedly the results of their teachings. Karatoṭa Dhammārāma, apart from his three famous verses, an example of a poetic riddle, composed in Sanskrit a George Rāja Aṣṭaka', in 1809, which is not to be found in Ceylon. After praising Alexander Johnstone, the district judge of Mātara,¹³ he continued in praise of the king George of England in 1809, with a Sinhalese paraphrase. Vāva Indasāra, the founder of the Vāva or Ransāgoḍa tradition of the Siamese sect, versified a 'Dhammarāja Aṣṭakaya' and 'Dāṭhā Aṭṭhaka' in Pali.¹⁴ Bōvala Dhammānanda wrote an aṣṭaka on John Armour, the assistant

13. The first 'line' of the first eight line stanza is thus;
 'kamala tuhina rasmi dugdha karpūra bhāra- haragiri
 suragangā kunda samkāsa kīrtim- adhikarana padastham
 sarva lōkaika devo- avatu pravara Jonston nāma lōka
 prasiddham'

(I have not altered/though scholars will see inaccuracies.
 This is preserved in the British Museum, OR 6601(11).

14. 'Saranankaro yōdhīmatatassa (sic) sissena sīlavantena
 Vāpiyo imam dāṭhāṭṭhakam ...'
 OR 6601(11).

agent of Mātara, in Sanskrit,¹⁵ and we have two verses written in Sinhalese following Sanskrit metres, in praise of Siṭṭināmaluvē Dhammajoti.¹⁶

These pieces are the only genuine evidence we have, though in some modern works a number of nominal headings of compositions are attributed to all the famous priest scholars of the Island since the establishment of the new Siamese sect in the second half of the eighteenth century. It is not inappropriate I believe to analyse the term 'aṣṭaka' or 'aṭṭhaka' employed by these traditional scholars in designating their poetical creations. A literary student would come across the term 'abhinava gāthā aṣṭaka prabandha', in most modern Sinhalese writings dealing with the history of Sinhalese literature, but none has cited a simple example for a creation of this calibre. 'aṣṭaka' means a composition consisting of eight separate stanzas or eight 'lines', written on a single subject following the metres of Sanskrit or Pali. The common characteristic of an aṣṭaka is the appearance of the same line at the end of every stanza or the same words at the end of every line. These poets have unchangeably followed

15. It starts with the following sentence (quoted as written);
'sampunnendunibha prasiddha pravara' RMOR nāmānūḍheyyam
taṁ śrēṣṭham śātaṁ varṣam viśvamadhikam bhūriśriyam
jīvatu'. OR 6601 (11).

16. OR 6601 (11).

this rigid form in their Pali and Sanskrit compositions but not in Sinhalese writings. The only surviving 'aṣṭaka' in Sinhalese, that of Ginigatpiṭṭiyē mentioned above, can be taken as an example here for the freedom the Sinhalese poets had in writings of aṣṭakas in Sinhalese. Apart from these aṣṭaka compositions written by these famous leading priests of the pupillary succession of Siṭṭināmaluvē and Vēhāllē bhikkhus, we have a considerable amount of Sinhalese versifications attributed to the pupils of these bhikkhus, mostly of Siṭṭināmaluvē, in the latter part of the hundred years following the establishment of the new Siamese sect in the second half of the eighteenth century. These were the poets who enriched (the) Sinhalese poetry during the fifty years prior to 1850. These poets, most of whom were of the same caste as their teacher, are known as the controversial 'Mātara poets' by the writers of Sinhalese literary history. Sāliālē Maniratana's 'Kav Mutu Hara' and 'Prātihārya Śatakaya', Dikvāllē Buddharakkhita's 'Kāvya Dīpanī', Maḍihē Siri Sumitta's 'Kav Mini Randama' (1832), Vālihiṭṭiyē Sirisumana's 'Kav Mini Pahana' (1840), Kirama Dhammānanda's¹⁷ 'Siyabas Maldama', 'Sambulā Jātaka Kāvya', 'Dēvadharmā Jātaka Kāvya', 'Nandiya Velaṇḍa Katāva',

17. There were two Kirama priests of this period, Kirama Dhammānanda and Kirama Dhammārāma (Punci Kirama) respectively. Though all these works are traditionally attributed to Dhammānanda his authorship is mentioned only in Siyabas Maldama and Kav Mutu Hara.

'Kav Mutu Hara', 'Stuti Pūjā Kāvya', 'Vibat Maldama' and 'Prēta Vastuva', 'Talarāmbē Dhammakkhandha's 'Andhabhūta Jātaka Kāvya' and 'Diya Sāvul Sandēśa', Barana Gaṇitayā's 'Vāyasa Nimitta' and 'Nīlakobō Sandēśa' and Vīrtāmulle Gamagē Don Jānci De Silva Abhayagunavardhana's 'Viyovaga Ratnamālaya', 'Kav Mini Koṇḍola' and 'Ratavatī Katāva' or 'Kiṇḍuru Jātakaya' are the successive results of Dhammajoti's teachings on Sinhalese poetics.¹⁸ The reason for the difference between the attitude of Siṭṭināmaluvē to Sinhalese poetry and that of all the other leaders of the Siamese sect is still an unsolved problem.

Bentara Atthadassi, the founder of the Kālaṇi branch of the Siamese sect, was a masterly poet and his lengthy correspondence with the Sangharāja of Siam is still evidence of his versatility in Pali poetics. Among his pupils, the names of Yātrāmullē Dharmārāma and Kōmmala Indasāra can be remembered here in regard to Sinhalese poetry. Kōmmala priest imparted knowledge of Sinhalese poetical writing to the lay students of the area, and he is believed to be the composer of 'Katīsēru Baliya' or

18. I have omitted a handful of writers during this period of a hundred years, since we are not in a position to trace their scholarly tradition.

'the effigy of the catechist'¹⁹ written against the behaviour of Viparam, a pseudonym of Sirimāṇṇa, who debated with Mohoṭṭivattē at the Pānadura controversy on its second day.

Yātrāmullē Dhammārāma showed a keen interest in prosodical works and the standards of his knowledge of prosody can be seen from two letters of his written to Professor R.C.Childers in London on 8.8.1869 and 14.10.1869 respectively.²⁰ When Childers was inquisitive on a metre of a Pali stanza, Dharmārāma after stating the metre as 'Ārya Vipulā' cited examples from the authoritative texts on prosody used at that time, namely Vṛtta Ratnākaraya and Śṛtabōdhaya in Sanskrit, and Vuttodaya in Pali. He further referred to the scarcity of printed books on prosody in Ceylon, and said that the only other book which was in his possession apart from the books mentioned above was 'Chando Manjarī'. He unhesitatingly declared his desire for printed books on the subject, to Childers.²¹ Even with this limited number of sources he

19. Nobody knows of this composition in Ceylon, but one verse of the Kaḍatira section of it was told to me by Mullapiṭṭiye Rālahāmy.

20. OR 2258.

21. Chandas śāstraya gāna vistara kala pot Lamkāvē vāḍiya nāta. mehi nam pēna pot saha Chandōmanjarīyat mā laṅga tibenavā. Chandas gāna vistra kala pot oya raṭavala tibē nam ē pot balanḍa mama bohoma prasannayi.

had gained a clear vision on the subject which was exemplified when he authoritatively discussed some points with Childers.

Besides these interested declarations we have some of his versifications written on 26.9.1862. This can be named as a 'Childers Aṣṭakaya', a praise of R.C.Childers, with eight Pali stanzas. One can feel the genuine sentiments expressed by the priest poet to Childers, whom he thought of as the only true relative he had on earth.²²

His skill in Sinhalese verses also can be witnessed in the same document where we can read one of his Sinhalese verses. We are fortunate to have the paraphrase written by the same hand, without which the reader could hardly understand what he was saying.

" Sarada pahana guna maṇḍalāti tama	harana
pabāṇa viyatāsuru diya dana nada	karana
nomāṇa rusiri teda heli kala basa	gahana
sārada sobana Childers matiṇḍu	dinamina"

22. The first stanza is as follows;
 siva siva siva dantī kunda devinda dantī
 tuhina surasavanti sādīsodāta kittī
 mukhajita sita kanti dīghakālam sumanti
 jayatu jayatu Childers nāma bhūpāla mantī.
 OR 2259.

(May you live long minister Childers, who possesses great gentle qualities at the heart, who dispels ignorance, in constant association with scholars, creator of happiness in people, handsome and speaking nicely, like the sun in the autumn, which has a cooling effect, dispels the darkness of the world, always in the sky, with a sphere of fifty yōjanas, which opens the lotus flowers, and which has powerful rays.)

His mastership in the Pali language can be illustrated when one examines usages like 'kala basa' where he takes it as equivalent to Pali 'kalya bhāsa' to denote light.

Before we come to assess the association of the founders of Vidyodaya and Vidyāḷankāra with Sinhalese poetry, we must look into the activities of the other two sects of Buddhism in regard to poetry. The attitude of the bhikkhus of the Amarapura sect was a quite different one from that of the traditional scholars of the Siamese sect and it has a clear similarity with the teachings and ideas of Siṭṭināmaluvē and his pupils. We have read of the Pali compositions of Vāḷitara Vimalasāratissa mahāthera previously, and now we have evidence of his acquaintance with Sinhalese poetry and rhetoric. For the first time the last two chapters of Sidat Saṅgarāva, which had been neglected by the scholars of the Siamese sect for being associated with Sinhalese poetry, were paraphrased and edited by a disciple of Vimalasāratissa,

of the second generation.²³ In this treatise published in 1891 he discussed the alamkāras in the verses of 'Kāvyaśēkhara', 'Sasadā', 'Kusa Jātakaya' and 'Siyabas Lakara', and it is quite clear that these ancient Sinhalese poetical works were analysed according to the ancient art of rhetoric at the seat of learning of the Amarapura sect at Vālitara.

Mātara Saranapāla, a colleague of Vimalasāratissa and the disciple of Āmbagahapitiyē, compiled a treatise of poetical instructions on Sinhalese verse, namely 'Heladiv Abidānavata', in 1838. When compared with the other works on the subject this appears to be the most complete volume so far in Sinhalese.²⁴

Vālitōṭa Gñānatilaka thera not only imparted instruction on Sinhalese poetry to the students of his educational institute, but he himself was a poet in Sinhalese. 'Opisara Sandēśaya'²⁵ or the message sent through a village headman, was received by Gunatilaka, the chairman of the village Council at Bentara Valallāviṭi

23. A.W. Charles Perera, the editor of this work, was the pupil of B.D.S. Vijayaratna, whose teacher was Vimalasāratissa mahāthera and he says in the colophon thus; 'apāduru āduru vū Vimalasara nā yati saṇḍa kivivara biṅgu kāninaṇḍa padasara vaṇḍim bātiyen'.

24. This was printed in 1892.

25. Printed at Vidyāratnākara press at Vālitara in 1915 by K.A.D. Mendis Vaidyajīva.

Kōralē. The publisher of this work says that it is not a work of serious dedication but was written during his spare time as a pastime.²⁶

B.D.S.Vijayaratna, a pupil of Vimalasāratissa, in his introduction to 'Kāvya Śāstraya'(1891) has credited his teacher for most of the ideas expressed in the book. His poetic skill is also well praised,²⁷ and after his teacher's death he versified his life in Sinhalese under the title 'Vimalasāra Vata'.

An interesting convocation which will surprise the student of poetry was held at Vaskaḍuvē temple by the leading bhikkhus of the Amarapura sect in 1901, with Vaskaḍuvē nāyaka thera in the chair. On 12.8.1901, the degree of 'Śrī Vijaya Kavirāja Paṇḍita' was conferred on Don Martēlis Silva of Pānadura, as a mark of respect for the service he had rendered by writing forty-one poetical works in Sinhalese.²⁸

When all these materials are taken into account one can say that Sinhalese poetry was not neglected by

26. 'meya utsāhayakin yodana laddak nova yana ena gaman
kriḍā vaśayen yodana laddak bavada...'.
.

27. 'Lakdiva kivivaran ek mudun mal kada vū
apāduru Vimalsara nāv yatiṇḍu pada sara namadim'.
.

28. I have only seen two small compilations of his called
'Kāvyaavatāmsaya' and 'Śrī Ṣaḍvarṇa Kāvya', printed in
1908.

the bhikkhus of the Amarapura sect in their educational curriculum as it was by the priests of the Siamese sect. Unfortunately they could hardly find any famous educational seat after the establishment of the two pirivenas by the Siamese sect. If they had been courageous enough to have a separate educational seat of the calibre of Vidyodaya or Vidyāṅkārā, undoubtedly our discussion on Sinhalese poetry might have taken a more serious turn than is justified by the materials we discuss here.

To suit the ideals of the establishment, Rāmañña Nikāya, at the start in the first Code of Rules for bhikkhus prepared by the founder in 1871, adjured the bhikkhus 'to refrain from versification' (Kāvya citrākṣarādī prabandha koṭa gr̥hasthayaṇṭa nokīmada...). The bhikkhus of the Rāmañña sect were hardly able to found a sound educational seat in Ceylon during the period we discuss, thereby limiting our examination into the attitude of the leading bhikkhus towards Sinhalese poetry. But though there were restrictions imposed on versifying, they composed stanzas in Pali. They too believed, it appears to the student of literature, that the inhibition applied to writing verse in Sinhalese but not in Pali. The biography of Ilukvattē Medhankara, one of the foremost leaders of

the sect, provides us with a comparatively small number of versifications in illustration of this matter. Medhankara himself composed an eulogy in Pali and presented it to Prince Albert when he visited Kandy.²⁹ One can note that this was done when he was a novice of the Siamese sect. But we have evidence of his versifying even after he became one of the leading bhikkhus of the Rāmañña sect. At his Upasampadā ceremony at Mātara, he presented a 'upasampadā prabandha' in Pali to the examiners.³⁰ There are to the amazement of the reader a few Pali stanzas exchanged between Medhankara and Aṃbagahavattē Saranankara,³¹ who declared the prohibition on writing poetry in the Code of Rules.

Since both the great scholars who founded Vidyodaya and Vidyālankāra were members of the Siamese sect, we must here try to examine their attitude generally on poetry and especially on Sinhalese poetry. Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala, the principal of Vidyodaya Pirivena, versified in Pali and Sanskrit like the predecessor scholars of the sect, but not in Sinhalese. His 'upasampadā aṣṭakaya' was written

29. U. Suvannajoti, *Ilukvattē Mēdhankara Caritaya*, (1889), p. 2.

30. *ibid*, pp. 29-31.

31. *ibid*, pp. 26-27.

in Pali in 1848,³² and two Sanskrit stanzas written in commemoration of his teacher at Ratmalāna, Valānē Siddhattha,³³ were it is said inscribed on his memorial tomb in 1868. And on the occasion of the exhibition of the Tooth Relic at Kandy on the full moon day of Āsala in 1866, he composed three stanzas in Sanskrit and six in Pali.³⁴ 'Brāhmaṇa Dharma Kāvya' or Anusāsanā Sangrahaya³⁵ is believed to be a collection of Sinhalese verses of moral advice translated by Sumangala when he was a student novice at Ratmalāna, but surprisingly none of the writers on the book even cite any verse as an example and it seems that they only know of it by hearsay. When he compiled 'Sudarsanaya' in October 1862 during the religious struggle against the Christians he started the journal with original Pali stanzas written for the purpose. If the story of his poetical work at Ratmalāna is true, then he too resembles the character of Ginigatpiṭṭiyē Sangharakkhita, a close disciple of Saranankara, who

32. Y. Paññānanda, Śrī Sumangala Caritaya, (1947), Vol. 1, pp. 51-52.

33. Vidyodaya, edited by C. A. Hevavitarana, (1926), Vol. 1 No. 10, p. 402.

34. ibid, (1928), Vol. 3, NO. 4, pp. 101-102.

35. There is no unanimity about the title. Dr. V. H. Vitarana says 'Brāhma Dharma Kāvya' (Śrī Sumangala, edited by K. Sorata and P. Abayasēkara, (1962), p. 49). Dr. P. B. Sannasgala mentions it as 'Brāhma Dharmaya' (Sinhala Sāhitya Vamsaya, 1961, p. 641).

only versified in Sinhalese when he was a novice but not when he reached the ranks of a responsible bhikkhu. It is interesting to note here his omission of the last two chapters of Sidat Saṅgarāva which deals with poetical instruction in Sinhalese when he edited and paraphrased the book in 1884.

One will hardly see any difference between the attitudes of Ratmalānē Dhammāloka and Dharmārāma and that of Sumangala. We have no evidence of any creative poetical writing ^{by} of Dhammāloka. But a very authentic declaration comes in the biography of Dharmārāma, written by Piyadāsa Rāmacandra on Dharmārāma's sixtieth birthday, when he was still alive. The biographer reveals an informative event which exhibits the attitude of a great scholar on Sinhalese poetry. Dharmārāma, a studious novice of fourteen years of age, received a letter from a friend of Tuḍāvē Paṇḍita, with a Sinhalese verse, which reached the hands of his teacher, Dhammāloka. ³⁶ After reading the verse Dhammāloka advised the novice to refrain from writing poetry ³⁷ and he obediently

36. The verse is as follows;

sirisara nā niti pema kara sarasavi muva gābē vasana
 pirikaru nā guruvara saṇḍa sevumen sata dat mana mena
 vāḍahiṇḍina heraniṇḍu soṇḍa Dharmārāmaya supasana
 aḍa daninā hiṇḍa vāṇḍa deva garu vadanin sakimehasuna'
 P. Rāmacandra, Śrī Dharmārāma Caritaya, (1913), p. 16.

37. 'tamusē vānna kuḍā kālē kavi liyaṇṭa vunot ēvā matu
 kalaṭa nindā pinisa venavā',
 ibid, p. 16.

followed the advice, and even on his sixtieth birthday he happily confessed his adamant adherence to it. He never versified in Sinhalese during his lifetime. But Dharmārāma was a versifier of repute in Sanskrit, and on his return to Ratmalāna temple after studies in 1871 he wrote a Sanskrit stanza on the pandal erected to greet him.³⁸ At his upasampadā ceremony at Malvatta, he composed a spontaneous aṣṭaka in Pali and Sanskrit, in praise of the mahānāyaka therā.³⁹

The student of Sinhalese literature may be surprised to note the acceptance of Sanskrit and Pali poetical writings and the contempt for Sinhalese poetry by these masters of Vidyālankāra pirivena, when one examines 'Rāja Caritaya', presented by them to the Prince of Wales in 1875.⁴⁰ The teacher and the pupil, imitating the role of bhikkhus of earlier days, unofficially instructed the Prince on righteous administration, citing from Pali, Sanskrit and Sinhalese sources. Out of the forty-seven stanzas quoted from various sources Pali and Sanskrit played the important part while only two

38.P.Rāmacandra, op.cit, p.19.

39. ibid, p.22.

40.The original copy of Rāja Caritaya is preserved at the British Museum, OR 2788.

Sinhalese verses from Budugunāḷankāraya on taxation and punishment were presented. The eleven original stanzas were written in Sanskrit and Pali. At the beginning three stanzas in Sanskrit in accordance with Mālinī metre, and at the end eight stanzas in Pali in Vasantatilakā metre, though produced in three days' time, were remarkably good and correctly written. But unlike Sumangala, Dharmārāma, when editing 'Sidat Saṅgarāva' in 1902, included the last two chapters on prosody and rhetoric and appended a short note on 'Kavi Samaya' (Conventions of poetry).⁴¹

The ideals of these three great masters must have been followed faithfully by their disciples at the two institutes of learning, and they made every attempt by the end of the century to impart their knowledge of Pali and Sanskrit prosody and rhetoric. 'Vuttodaya' on Pali metrics was edited by Mullēriyāvē Vimalajoti of Galvāna temple, a pupil of Sumangala, in 1888. 'Śṛtabōdha-ya' on Sanskrit prosody was translated into Sinhalese by Vāḷiviṭṭiyē Dhammaratana, a pupil of Sumangala, in 1887.

While these two great seats of learning excluded the older works of instruction on Sinhalese poetry in

41. Sidat Saṅgarāva, edited by R. Dharmārāma, (1902), p. 203.

this manner, some other lay writers and publishers printed these works, disregarding the attitude of the priest scholars. Thus Talgahagoḍa Ratanajoti's 'Nava Nāmāvaliya' was printed at Suratura press by Juvānis Silva in 1872, Bhadra's 'Elu Saṅdās Lakuna' in 1874, 'Nāmāvaliya', a lexicographical text, was published in 1882. The text of 'Lakunu Sara' was printed in 1883. 'Siyabas Lakara' with a paraphrase was published in 1892, and Baṭuvantudāvē Pandit printed two ancient glossaries for poets, namely 'Ruvan Mala' and 'Piyum Mala', in 1892 and Tambiappu Gurunnānsē paraphrased 'Kav Lakunu Mini Mal' and printed it in 1899.

The scholars of Vidyodaya pirivena, as we have said earlier, exhibited their mastership of Pali and Sanskrit poetical theory in their published works. When Vidyodaya expanded its branches in the Island some principals of those seats of learning felt a duty to impart knowledge of Sinhalese poetics. J.P.Amarasinha, a pupil of Maḍugallē Siddhārtha, principal of Sangharāja Pirivena, Kandy, after feeling the necessity of printing a paraphrase of the last two chapters of Sidat Saṅgarāva did so in 1892. But in 1907, the false interpretations and the shallow knowledge of Sinhalese poetical theory

demonstrated by this writer were exposed by W.F. Gunavardhana, who criticised this work and its interpretation on a verse of Rāhula in Sālalihiṇi Sandēśa.⁴² In his introduction to Guttila Kāvya, W.F. Gunavardhana, one of the pioneers of the critical appreciation of poems and a great independent critic of the first quarter of the twentieth century, also criticised the unfavourable attitude of the principals of traditional seats of learning, affiliated to Vidyodaya pirivena, on rhetoric as 'a system of beautifully lying'.⁴³

In spite of the deplorable treatment of Sinhalese poetry by the traditional scholars of the time, three poetical works appeared in 1876. 'Bāḍovrā Katāva' of Kristain Perera, 'Kaliyuga Śāntiya' and 'Atula Rāja Katāva' were printed in 1876. With an examination of these three works one can realise the pressure exerted by the traditional scholars, the struggle of the new poets and the essential factors in the establishment of this new tradition of poetry in Sinhalese literature.

42. J.P. Amarasingha saw faults in the verse 'aga pipi mal' in 'Sidat Saṅgarāvē Antyārdhaya', (1892), p. 33. W.F. Gunavardhana criticised the statements, without mentioning the author of the work, in Guttila Kāvya Varṇanā, p. lix.

43. 'samahara paṇḍita kenek mē vanāhi boru śāstrayeka, meya igenagānmen kam kimḍāyi kiyana bavada kisiviṭeka asanta lābē. mē śāstrayehi uganvanu labannē boru opa lā kiyana kramayayi... mē dūṣakayangen samahara denaku parivēnādhipatīhuda vet',
W.F. Gunavardhana, Guttila Kāvya Varṇanā, (1916), p. lxiv and p. lxx.

'Bāḍovrā Katāva' is the longest poem in this tradition of poetry so far. This was only the first part of the projected book and it consists of one thousand and seventy verses. The other parts did not reach the readers, as far as we know. The story was taken from 'The Arabian Nights' Entertainments'.⁴⁴ Small paintings in black and white were drawn in this book, and this is the first time Sinhalese readers had seen such sketches in a poetical work, which highlighted the important incidents of the story. This also can be considered as the first time Sinhalese readers read a story from that world famous text.

'Kaliyuga Śāntiya' of Vijayamini, a native physician, reveals the story of Kāli Yakkhiṇī in Saddharma Ratnāvaliya. The purpose of writing the poem is interesting. The feelings aroused by a woman deserted by her husband motivated him to write this work.⁴⁵ But one can hardly see any relation between this actual event in contemporary society and the story he narrated in the poem. He wanted not to relate the events of the story but to advise his

44. 'The Story of the Prince Camaralzaman and the Princess Badoura', in 'The Arabian Nights' Entertainments, edited by E.W. Lane, (1853), pp. 287-327.

45. vadā daruvan vehesauna ek liyek himiyā hāra damā
vādā duk vāda haṇḍana bava dāna saḥane vīmaṭa āyalāmā
yodā bana pada samaga kele mema pota sita se mā
hoṇḍākārava ugat vedasata Vijayamini vedāduru tumā'
Vijayamini, Kaliyuga Śāntiya, unpaginated, verse 77.

readers on various fields, to give advice to parents who have daughters, advice for pure women, advice for men who intend to leave their wives in search of new spouses, advice for young people who conceal venereal diseases, and to describe the characteristics of a flirtatious man. Out of the 78 verses the story occupies only 16 verses (7-18 and 68-71). He started the story in the seventh verse and at the end of the eighteenth he says, 'me katā atara bana- kiyami mage mata nāna mena' (in the midst of this story I will preach according to my knowledge), and asks the reader who is only interested in the story to start again from verse 68 leaving out all the sermons.⁴⁶

By the simile the poet employs, the reaction of the medicine given for the abortion is beautifully conveyed.

'dunat samagama vāṭuni geḍiyē nāṭṭa gālavunu vigasaṭā'⁴⁷

(It fell like a fruit from its stem.)

His ideas on marriage and love are surprisingly radical for that time. One might wonder whether he advocates free love without marriage.

'kasādaya kumakaṭada senehasa ātot dennage kiya maṭā'⁴⁸

(If both are in love why should one marry?)

46. 'mē katāvastuva ataraṭa kāvya kartṛgē matayen siyalu denāṭama dānamitikam dakvanu lābē. mē kata vastuva pamaṇak kiyavanna kāmāti kenek 68 veni kavīyē paṭan balanu'.

47. Vijayamini, op. cit, verse 14.

48. ibid, verse 37.

'kāsūvat nokāsuvat kamsāpa viñdina koṭa sāpa eka ledā
kāsūmaya saki kiyannē ara pāna allana eka vedā'⁴⁹

(The registration of the marriage would not affect the sexual happiness. After all what is marriage? Only the signature. Is not it?)

His linguistic expressions will be a matter of interesting humour to the reader. One can note here his usage of 'kasāda bāndat' as ' kāsūvat'.

'Atula Rāja Katāva' taken from a Tamil source was composed with three hundred and eight verses by a poet of the Seven Kōralēs in a earlier century.⁵⁰ Though its material is associated with Tamil literature, the superstitious belief in Saturn as a disastrous planet for human life is accepted by Sinhalese people.⁵¹ The poet says anybody who reads the verses of his book will overcome the ill influence of Saturn.⁵²

49. Vijayamini, op.cit, verse 38.

50. Dr. P.B. Sannasgala mentions an 'Atula Raja Puvata' written by a grandson of Vanigavanna Dhanapāla Mudali and says it is unprinted. Sinhala Sāhitya Vanśaya, pp. 399-400. In the printed copy no such name is mentioned.

51. A popular story tells how Viṣṇu ate bamboo leaves under the influence of Saturn.

52. 'kiva mekatā sate ka
häreta kivu Sani apala nova sāka' verse 8,
'apala Sanigen van kenek kiva äsuva me katā vē maṅgul'
verse 300.

This year marks the strengthening of these publications as a commercial enterprise. For the first time we come across of the idea of 'copyrights' in Atula Rāja Katāva and Kaliyuga Śāntiya. The 'ayitiya' of these publications were sold to the publisher and publisher pays the printing bill. Kaliyuga Śāntiya was priced at 25 cents and Atula Rāja Katāva at 50 cents. Certainly these prices are handsomely high at that time. One had at least to give up one week's meals to buy this book since the price of a pound of rice was five cents. These publishers to gain the highest sale of their books employed booksellers who would announce the name of the book and the story of the work and the price. For these purposes the publisher printed one or more verses in the title page of the book. The title page of 'Kaliyuga Śāntiya' reads thus;

'sata sita alavana tatu āti mema	pota
sata visipahakaṭa vikunami aḍu	nāta
sata dat paṇḍi gena bāluvot kara	meta
sata visipaha vaṭinākama hāṅgi	yata'

(I sell this enjoyable interesting book for a price not less than 25 cents. Any scholar who reads the book will realise the validity of the money he has spent.)

At the front page of 'Atula Rāja Katāva' we read this verse;

' patala diyata Senasuru äti nil gata
 Atula rajuta pera parasidu daranata
 apa la karapu vaga äti mema kav pota
 kuhula novav gānumaṭa panasata sata'

(The story of Atula, the famous king who was victimised by the blue-coloured Saturn is related in this book. Don't hesitate to buy the book for fifty cents.)

The publisher and book seller had no rivals to point out their inaccuracies or mistakes in their ventures. But the writers had to face the criticisms of the scholars of that time. The authors of these poems were afraid of the fault-seeking scholars of the day, most probably the traditional scholars produced by the two seats of learning, and were scared of them. Note the humbleness of this poet in front of their scholarship.

' sāmata hāṅgena lesa gurupada harimi na
 e maṭa raṭē vāvahara vena pada gena
 memaṭa hāṅgena lesa pavasana kavi gāna
 kumaṭa karanudō apahasa paṇḍi dana' 53

(Leaving all difficult words, taking the easiest colloquial terms which could be understood by all readers, I versify as I can. Why should scholars insult these verses?)

When the reader becomes aware by this evidence that this new group of poets were not accepted as scholars by the traditional writers, he will certainly be interested to have an idea of their identity. James D'Alwis, in his informative introduction to Sidat Saṅgarāva, mentions a popular tradition of poetry which existed in about 1850 in the Island. D'Alwis wrote thus;

"The traveller and the missionary must have both observed that frequently after night-fall a group of people assembles around a man who professes to read to them. The writer has not only observed this himself in the villages adjoining towns, but also in the very heart of Matura, Galle, Colombo and Kandy. The books which are commonly used amongst them are many".⁵⁴

D'Alwis described four categories of popular poetical works used at that time among these readers, and we are able to see that some of the books which we discussed in the last chapter are among them. The similar books found in the list of D'Alwis and in our discussion are 'Mōḍa Mālaya', Sinhavallī Katāva', 'Āṇḍi Māle', 'Dinatara Katāva', 'Sulāmbāvatī Katāva', 'Atula Katāva' and 'Dēvadatta Varunē'.⁵⁵

With the spreading of the printing presses thus we see how this popular tradition of poetry came to the limelight and was transformed into a intensely

54. James D'Alwis, Sidat Saṅgarāva, (1852), introduction, p. lxxii.

55. ibid, pp. lxxiii-lxxvi.

popular medium at this time. After the publication of these three poetical works in 1876, we enter an enigmatic period of eight years, until the appearance of 'Kalla Mālaya', in 1884 at Galle. We have no single printed poetical work during this eight year period. The reasons for the occurrence of this inscrutable period are hardly to be found now.

In the preceeding chapter when we were discussing the development of the new poetical tradition in Sinhalese, from 1852 to 1875, I have suggested that any research on this subject has to be done along the lines of classification in the fields of subject matter, poetic language and metre, since those were the serious problems which confronted the unsophisticated poets of that time. During the next two decades starting from 1884 these new experiments saw a steady prolongation at the hands of the new generation of poets.

In this period, again, we come across varied experiences and subjects associated with Buddhist religion, described in thin volumes of poetry. Jātaka tales or the birth stories of the Lord Buddha, most of them now original compositions, were narrated by these new poets in this generation. 'Sāma Jātaka Viridu Pota' of Don Arnōlis

Jayavickrama of Vāligama, 'Saṇḍakiṇḍuru Jātakaya' of an unknown poet, which is enacted by the folk dramatists as a 'Kōlam play' even now, where we find a considerable number of verses taken from Vilgammula text,⁵⁶ and 'Pirininivan Jātakaya', which is not a tale from the Jātaka book, but the work of a contemporary hand which describes the events of Lord Buddha's passing away, were printed in 1885 by S.A.Z.Sirivardhana at Galle. In 1886, 'Abhinava Kusa Jātakaya' of K.R.Perera was printed by J.D.Fernando, 'Tarka Jātaka Kāvya' of the same poet was printed by L.H.Alwis, and 'Tēmiya Jātaka Viridu Pota' of Don Pedris Abhayagunavardhana of Nākulugamuva was printed by S.A.Z.Sirivardhana, at Galle. 'Nivi Jātaka Kāvya' with a hundred and four verses, by B.Gunaratna, was printed at Jos Fonseka and Sons, by the publisher, N.N. Kurē Appuhāmy, and 'Mahā Supina Jātakaya' and 'Solos Svapnaya' which deal with the same story were printed in 1887. The running of 'Vidhura Jātaka' to five editions in this short period is clear evidence of the popularity of Jātaka tales in verse among readers. This time it was printed at Sudarsana press by F.Kurē.

56. Out of the 57 verses 15 were taken from Vilgammula. Numbers in the brackets in the following lines are of the new work. 379(32), 384(31), 386(23), 385(35), 388(47), 394(34), 395(36), 396(37), 398(38), 404(42), 402(43), 407(50), 408(51), 409(52), 391(33). These numbers are compared with the edition of Saṇḍakiṇḍuru Dā Kava by Valānē Dhammānanda, (1931), printed at Sēvya Śrī press.

K.R.Perera's 'Ānanda Bōdhi Jātakaya' was published by Agalavattē Kōrālalāgē Don Teigis Appuhāmy at Ilakminipalaṅga press in 1889, and 'Ummagga Jātaka Kāvya', Perera's longest composition, in eight hundred and one verses, was printed at Lōkārtha Sādhaka Press in the same year, while his 'Mahā Sīlava Jātakaya', consisting of ninety-nine verses, was printed at Granthaparakāśa Press by W.A.D.Silva in 1891.

Don Hendrick Dias Appuhāmy published 'Suvarnamayura Jātakaya' of K.R.Perera in 1892, his 'Abhinava Kusa Jātakaya' ran to a second edition six years after its first appearance, and Perera's 'Vessantara Jātaka Viriduva' with 87 Viridu verses was published by W.A.D.Silva and J.D.Fernando in this year. 'Muva Jātakaya' of a past poet was printed by D.S.Fernando, and 'Kav Mini Randama' or 'Pancāyudha Jātakaya' of Siri Sumitta of Talakaṇḍa temple or Godakanda temple, written in 1832, was published by Bādigama Don Diyōnis Disānāyaka Appuhāmy and Don Hendrick Appuhāmy at Satya Samuccaya Press.

In 1893, 'Sāma Jātakaya' of K.R.Perera appeared again in its second edition. 'Būridatta Jātakaya' of an older poet was printed at the Buddhist Press, Kandy. 'Culla Paduma Jātaka Kāvya' of Jayasūriya Āraccigē George Perera was published by C.A.P. and J.E.P. Samarasēkaras

at Lakrivikirana press in this year. 'Mahā Padaranga Jātakaya' of Kobbākaḍuvē priest,⁵⁷ written in 1692, the longest poem printed up till then, with 1635 verses was printed at Śāstrādhāra press.

Another version of Kusa Jātakaya appeared under the title 'Kusarāja Mangallaya', a narration of events from the birth of Kusa, the Aspiring One, to the malicious treatment of Pabāvatī, his wife, at the stables, written by Agalavattē Nākāttā of Mātalē, published in 1894. 'Mātanga Jātakaya' of Don Abraham Karunāratna āracci, and was published by G.M.Perera at Śilpālankāra Press.

In 1895, 'Kummāsapinḍa Jātaka Kāvya' of Kavisēkara Nandana of Devundara written in 1675 was printed at Mahātīrtha Śrīdhara Press, Mātara, by J.P.Ekanayaka. 'Dīgha (sic) Kosala or Kosamba Jātakaya' or 'Kav Mini Pahana' of Vālihiṭṭiyē Vajiragnānālankāra Sirisumana composed in 1840 was published by Vijayavardhana Hēvāmirissageyi Don Kornēlis of Dikvālla, at the same press, in that year.

'Alambusā Jātaka Kāvya', apparently an older text, was published by W.G.S.Perera at Sarasvatī Press in 1896,

57. According to the sixth verse, the author of the poem is this priest, but the colophon to the printed version gives the name of Kirimāṭṭiyāvē as the author. D.R. Seneviratna, in his edition in 1929, says in another version he found the author's name as 'Mutuvē Upāsaka'.

and the same story with slightly different personalities written by Vīrasinha Mudaligē Ukkubandā of Vāligama, was printed at Śāstrādhāra press in 1898, as 'Nālinī Jātaka Kāvya'.

It is quite clear that with the remarkable expansion in the number of presses during the last decade in Colombo, Galle, Mātara and Kandy, the publishers were now able to print contemporary original poetical works of hitherto unknown poets. 'Sāma Jātaka Viriduva', 'Abhinava Kusa Jātakaya', 'Tarka Jātaka Kāvya', 'Tēmiya Jātaka Viridu Pota', 'Ānandabōdhi Jātaka Kāvya', 'Suvarnamayura Jātaka Kāvya', 'Vessantara Viriduva', 'Kusarāja Mangallaya' and 'Nālinī Jātaka Kāvya' come under the list of contemporary original works. These famous and popular stories were versified to satisfy the essential need of the readers who preferred to read the stories in verse rather than in prose.⁵⁸ Kusa Jātaka Kāvya of Alagiyavanna written in 1610 was hardly intelligible (or so he says) to the readers of that time and it called for two new versifications of the same story. The reader will notice another interesting factor,

58. At the back page of most of these new compositions the reader will find similar statements to this effect, which read in most cases as follows; 'yam katāntarayaḥ vāsagamen kiyavanavāṭa vaḍā kavīyen kiyavīmaṭa āsīmaṭa vāḍi denā kāmāti bava parasiddhayi'.

that four of these original Jātaka poems, namely Culla Paduma, Tarka, Nālinī and Suvarnamayura described the characteristics of women harmful to the way of purification in the Buddhist church, a popular belief among the Buddhists. The illustration and diffusion of such an accepted belief which could soothe the ears of the listeners and readers appears to be considered as the duty of a writer of that time, even if their knowledge of Sinhalese language and poetics hardly allowed the writers to fulfil their tasks.⁵⁹

Almost all the writers accepted their ignorance of grammatical Sinhalese language and the science of poetry, but they believed that they must versify these stories for the benefit of the reading public. But one can hardly say that these poets were ignorant of classical poems; at least we have to accept that they had read some parts of these works. The similes employed by these poets were nothing new and they resuscitated the same rigid old devices which had been exhausted by the poets of the past centuries. One can not see any originality in their statements. Compare the following two verses of the

59. 'mama mebandak niskalankava gotannaṭa pamana Sinhala bhāṣāvabōdhayakut nātiva meya mesē karannaṭa kalpanā kelē mebaṇḍu dharmōvavādayak (sic) lovaṭa prakāśa kirimē mahat phala mahānisaṇsa sahāya kara genayi', J.A.G.Perera, Sulu Piyum Dā Kava or Culla Paduma Jātaka Kāvya, introduction.

features of two separate women, by two different poets in Mātanga Jātaka Kāvya and Ānandabōdhi Jātaka Kāvya.

"varala monara pila	vilasaṭa
nalalada aḍasaṇḍa	vilasaṭa
debāma edēdunu	vilasaṭa
desavan rantōḍu	lesaṭa" 60
"varala monara pila	vilasin
nalalada aḍasaṇḍa	vilasin
debāmada dēdunu	vilasin
desavan taru rās	vilasin" 61

Tangible results of the employment of classical devices without a clear understanding, can be seen in the comparisons of ears to golden earrings by the former and to the rays of stars by the latter.

Regarding the language, to suit the number of syllabic instants of a poem, the poets made every attempt to employ words, sometimes startling but more or less suitable, derived from Pali or Sanskrit.

"mema rataṭa	nuduruva
<u>caṇḍāla grāmak</u>	uva" 62
"vēya dāna gata mānavi	<u>buvipala</u> " 63

60.D.A.Karunāratna, Mātanga Jātaka Kāvya,(1894),verse 23.

61.K.R.Perera, Ānandabōdhi Jātaka Kāvya,(1889),verse 69.

62.idem, verse 12.

63.K.R.Perera, Ummagga Jātaka Kāvya,(1889), verse 368.

"sāririka udēśika
 dumiñdu ā pāribhōgika
 me tun sāyen eka
sāyaka vāñdi kala... " 64

Sometimes a reader will be puzzled to find two different levels of language used by the same poet. Culla Paduma Jātaka Kāvya exhibits a more refined language with a classical touch in some of its descriptions.

" bun maru sañda dumiñdu net iñdunil mine na
 man lesa pudā gevamin sat sati pemi na" 65

Meanwhile one will be surprised to find the following phrases of the same poet employed in the same work, which are colloquial.

"kiyava apa veta medān hanikaṭa" 66

The inability of some versifiers of Jātaka tales even to put the correct number of syllabic instants in each line, has spoilt the rhythm for recitation and makes it sound awkward.

"budurajuge guna bañda
 ādāhana kelē avamaṅgul tada" (Pirinivan Jātakaya)
 "vāḍa piyum piṭa sat
 kelē sinhanada pā visēsat" (,, ,,)

64.K.R.Perera, Ānandabōdhi Jātakaya,(1889), verse 17.

65.J.A.G.Perera,op.cit, verse 9.

66. ibid, verse 109.

When we consider the pivotal part played by the upcoming presses in the main cities of the Island by printing, publishing, distributing and selling the new Jātaka versifications, we can see that they must have solidified the new poetical tradition in the country at the turn of the century. The normal maximum number of copies printed of a book was two thousand, which will surprise the reader when he is aware that even after a century there appears hardly any difference in the numbers printed of a creative work even of a famous writer. Printers who invited a writer to versify a story and assumed the status of the publisher, after paying his fee, no doubt a small sum, ruthlessly destroyed all the connections of that work with its author. 'Nivi Jātaka Kāvya' was composed by B.Gunaratna, as appears from the note at the end, but according to the introductory note appended to the printed work, which discredits the publisher now, the poem was merely composed by a famous poet (prasiddha kāvyakkārayek visin viracitayi). Some printers printed more copies than the promised number,⁶⁷ and to curb this subversive act writers who published their own books produced a seal (at muddaraya) with their

67. Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala on 25.9.1875 informed E.R.Gunaratna of such presses in a letter and said thus; 'potak accu gasā denṭa bāra gena kopi ganana vāḍiya accu gasā gannē horakam karana ayayi.esē karana ayagē kantōruvak Kaiman dorakaḍaṭa āsannava tibena bava sālayi.tavat ekak tibena bava apaṭa dānagaṇṭa lābī tibenavā'.

name on the first page of every book and warned malpracticers to beware of prosecution. Commission was paid to the booksellers, and the retail booksellers of the country were encouraged to buy in hundreds which would carry handsome commissions. With these publications of Jātaka poems we can see the growth of the poetical tradition into a successful commercial enterprise.

Another important feature introduced by these poets into the new poetic tradition was a new reciting technique with a completely modern tune. These works are called 'viridu'. Some of the works designated as 'viriduva' are mentioned above, and some other writings of this period, namely 'Viridu Alankāraya' of Allis Raban Gurunnānsē, 'Nākat Satvissē Viridu Pota', 'Mahabinikman Viridu Pota' and 'Sūvisi Vivaranayē Viridu Pota', all printed in Galle in 1885, were composed after the same method. The lines consist of 24 matras, and this metre is not new to the Sinhalese prosodical works but the significance of this tune lies in the way of reciting it. The last 12 syllabic instants at the end of the second and fourth lines have to be repeated with the beat of the musical instrument called 'rabāna'. These tales were narrated in the form of a dialogue between two people in a competitive mood in front of a listening audience. Both were trying to

pretend to be masters of the tale and versification; when one enquires of an event, the other relates it authoritatively, giving the listeners the opportunity to understand the story in full. I will illustrate an instance in 'Sāma Jātaka Viridu Pota'.

"enavada uṃba mā samagin tava tava taraṅgeṭa	kiyaṇḍa
banavada mama uṃben āhuve mē sabayaṭa tōra	denda
bāruvada sakiyani menuṃbaṭa mē gāna vistara	kiyaṇḍa
monavada ara tapasun haṭa tibune dukak pala	devaṇḍa
"menna itin naluvani bāri uṃben memaṭa gālavi	ganda
onna bolan epā tavat vāḍi vāḍiyen uḍa	paniṇḍa
binna novana lesaṭama mama dannava dahamen	kiyaṇḍa
venna tibuna duka nam saki dennage ās anda	vena" ⁶⁸

(The first one asks: Are you again trying to compete with me in saying verses? I asked for religious matters only to be delivered to this audience. My friend, I hope you are able to describe this event. If so, tell me what was the disaster which confronted that hermit.

The other replies: Oh, I can not get rid of you. But beware. Do not try to be funny with me. I know the religious texts very well. The disaster he had to face was blindness in his eyes.)

The twofold life story of the Master, when he was prince Siddhārtha and later as Lord Buddha, supplied the

68. D.A. Jayavickrama, Sāma Jātaka Viridu Pota, (1885), verses 5 & 6, p.1.

subject matter for some creations in this period. 'Buduguna Saṅgarāva' of K.R.Perera written in the dialogue form between a Brahmin and a devotee was printed at Dināḷankāra Press in 1894 and narrates the serene qualities of the 25 Buddhas of this aeon including Gautama, the trees under which they attained Buddhahood, and the places where Gautama Buddha spent the first seven weeks after the Enlightenment. Prince Siddhārtha was born at Kapilavastu in India. P.P.Jayavardhana of Kurunāgala in 1897 versified the beauties of that city as 'Kapilavastu Alankāraya' and printed it at Sēvya Śrī Press at Pāliyagoḍa. Siddhārtha's first vivaranaya or prediction of future Enlightenment was given at the feet of Dīpankara Buddha when the Aspiring One was born as Sumedha. M.H. Arnōlis composed a poem on this event in 'Buduguna Viriduva' in the form of a dialogue between two friends and printed it at Vaidya Śāstrāḷankāra press in 1895. The birth of Siddhārtha in his last birth until his passing away as the Master was added to the above mentioned story in 'Siduhāt Sirita' of Mātalē Ratanajoti therā, printed at Albion's Press in Galle in 1896. Prince Siddhārtha left his royal mansions in his twenty ninth year in search of higher ideals of life and from this event up to the Enlightenment is described in 'Kavi

Mahabinikmana', a work of a past century, published by Sayanēris De Soyza Amarasēkara of Vālitōṭa in 1889, and in 'Mahabinikman Viridu Pota' by K.R.Perera printed in 1885. The story of how Siddhārtha deserted his wife Yasōdharā, who spent her remaining period of life devotedly until she entered the Order of Nuns, is related in 'Yasōdarā Vata', a work of a poet in the past of unknown date, which was first printed by M.D.R.Appuhāmy in 1891; while another new composition, a poor imitation of the earlier poem, was printed under the same title by D.S.Ranasinha Appuhāmy in 1887 at the Free School Press at Kandy and a second edition issued in the following year, at the press of the Technical College at Kandy. The Bo tree under which Siddhārtha attained the Buddhahood is described by Āmbagollē priest in 'Bōmāḍa Alankāraya' in 1891. The Enlightenment of Siddhārtha was harassed by Māra and his three daughters, according to religious texts. This is described in 'Māra Yuddhaya' of K.R.Perera and 'Budumula Upata Saha Buduguna Sāntiya Hevat Maraṅgana Sāhālla' printed in 1890 and 1893 respectively. After Siddhārtha attained Buddhahood the events connected with his life were not considered as worthy of versification by these poets. Only two further incidents of his life, the story of Ālavaka and the story of the Licchavi kings,

appeared as 'Purāna Alav Sāhālla', the work of a past poet, and 'Licchavi Katāva' of K.R.Perera.

The term 'sāhālla' associated with 'Maraṅgana Sāhālla' and 'Alav Sāhālla' is interesting. 'Elu Saṇḍās Lakuna', the oldest prosodical work in Sinhalese, mentions a metre called 'sāhāli'. But this term here denotes not a metre but a 'tale'. Even the present day villager might call any story which is excessively prolonged a 'hālla'. 'Maraṅgana Sāhālla' describes, event by event, the preparations of the three daughters of Māra to seduce Siddhārtha, individually naming all the herbs taken to produce a capsule called 'Bōdisatta Guliya'. Thus 'sāhālla' can be interpreted as a tale in verse, with lengthy and elaborately descriptive events.

Life stories of famous arahat disciples of Lord Buddha, namely Sāriputta, Mahā Kassapa, Anuruddha and Upāli, which came in the form of Sinhalese translations of Pali sources were versified by A.P.Idirisinha of Mātara in 'Rahat Caritaya' which was printed in 1892. He was aware of the liking of ordinary people to hear verses rather than prose and he says that he had made many efforts to compose these tales (kavivalaṭa nagā bohō mānsiyak darā). But his efforts could not supply him with a language to enrich the poetic beauty.

Note for instance;

'vīya giriyak pasan visitura'

In this sentence note the use of 'giriya' for 'girak'. And in 'surūci nam tapasva mama- vasati ...' the first person singular subject 'mama' is joined by the writer with the plural verb of the third person 'vasati'.

Apart from the Jātaka book, the poets of this new poetical tradition turned to Saddharmāḷankāraya and Saddharma Ratnāvaliya for stories to versify. 'The story of three friends' which comes as the second tale of 'Tun Yahalu Vagga' in the former, was printed in 1886 at Galle. The poet has mixed colloquial terms with the written language in some places.

"siyotun saha sivpāvo da
miriṅgu dākala jalayakva da" 69

In the written language one would not use the last character 'la' in the term 'dākala', which is constantly employed in the colloquial language. When the cobra and the parrot, two of the friends, visited the man, the third friend, the poet describes the scene by transforming it into a human and modern social event.

"hābāyi miture dān sihi vuna
vādi veyan āvit metana" 70

69. Tun Yahalu Katāva, (1886), verse 9, p.1.

70. ibid, verse 48, p.6.

"yannaṭa ada bāriya gama ṭa

siṭapan miturani ṭikakaṭa" ⁷¹

(Oh. Now I remember you. Please sit down here. Today you can't go home. My friends, please stay.)

This same story was versified by V.M.Vijayasinha in 1894, as 'Tun Yahalu Puvata', which was compiled when the author was sixteen and is evidently a poor production. "mepota nimūyemi gana saṇḍās ā dosut siṇḍeva belen teruvana"

'Nimūyemi' is a funny form of the verb 'nimā' (to finish) and one can hardly recite the line to any accepted tune in Sinhalese literature.

The seventeen year old novice at Vālukārāmaya, Kōṭṭegoda, called Sugunatissa, composed the story of Buddheni, which was taken from Saddharmāḷankāraya, following the traditional system of poetry, and two devotees of the temple, who were greatly satisfied with it, printed it as 'Buddeniyā Vata' in 1895. 'Yakini Puvata', printed in 1897, related the famous story of the female demon called Kāli which appears in 'Saddharma Ratnāvaliya'.

'Rāvana Yuddhaya' of K.R.Perera, is a confused version of Daśaratha Jātaka and of Rāmāyana,⁷² which

71. op.cit, verse 49, p. p.6.

72. In India Rāmāyana is a more popular book and it has influenced every religious and social field of India, but in Ceylon it never became so widely known.

was printed in 1893. It seems that he had heard the latter from someone and considering the similarities of the two stories he combined the two, which now misleads the reader.

Milinda Praśnaya, a popular text among Buddhists, was related in 'Nāgasēna Svāmīngē Saha Miliṇḍu Rajatumāget Jīvita Katāva' of K.R.Perera in 1890.

Legendary beliefs about the Universe, the beginning of the Aeon, and its end, spread through the commentarial literature of Buddhist texts among the ordinary Buddhists. Poems describing these beliefs were not accurate or scientific descriptions, but exaggerated versions of the written accounts, as the poets have heard them in religious sermons. 'Sakvala Vistaraya' printed in 1886, 'Kalpōtpatti Mālaya' in 1889, and 'Kaliyugaya' were three such books.

Two poems were written by K.R.Perera on the lives of two great personalities in India and Ceylon, who had marvellously helped the Buddhist church. The great king Asoka, who assisted in diffusing Buddhism in many parts of Asia, was eulogised in 'Dharmāsōka Vata' printed in 1893, while Duṭugāmunu, a king of Ceylon, who waged a war against an Indian prince on the pretext of safeguarding Buddhism in Ceylon, was described in 'Duṭugāmunu Vata' printed in 1891.

Except 'Duṭṭugāmunu Vata' all the other new poetical works which we have described up to now deal with India as the social background. The poets of this period also developed the new type of poem to express contemporary incidents associated with religion in Ceylon. A discussion on these original works will show how far these new poets are responsible for the expansion of the subject matter in the new poetical tradition.

'Samanala Rock', popularly known as 'Śrī Pādaya' where the Lord Buddha has embodied his footprint, is a place of utmost significance to the Buddhists in Ceylon. 'Samanta Kūṭa Vaṇṇanā' of Vedeha thera, a Pali composition, had become almost unintelligible to the readers of that day and to satisfy them with a simple version of it, appeared Balangoḍa Guru's 'Samanala Vistaraya', a description of Samanala, published by P.R.S.Fernando, a native physician, in 1897.

'Samanala Kanda' is the accepted abode of God Saman, one of the guardian deities of Ceylon, and he was eulogised in 'Sirō Pādaya', which was printed in 1887.

At a time when the modern facilities on Śrī Pāda were not available, the experts who went there annually on foot felt that it was their duty to instruct other

would- be pilgrims on the 'holy travel' to Śrī Pāda.

Disānāyaka Don Lavarenti, who had paid a visit annually to the rock for the last thirtyone years not only described the way to Śrī Pāda starting from Kosgashandiya, but advised the pilgrims on their behaviour during the journey in 'Sirī Pāda Gaman Vistaraya'.

"bat kana kala hisa vana vana kaṇṭa epā
ot ot tāna vāṭilā nidiyeṇṭa epā" (verse 13).
(When having meals do not shake your head⁷³ and do
not sleep carelessly.)

The poet, accepting his inefficiency in grammar (viyarana dos emaṭa), sold the copyright of the work to H.P.Siññappuhāmy who printed it in 1891 at Lakdiv Press.

Yon Mereñña Simanhēvāgē Sārlis Silva composed another work of instructions to the pilgrims called 'Siri Saranābhivādanaya' which was printed in 1892. K.D.Siyadōris in 1890 printed K.R.Perera's 'Samanala Gamana Saha Śrī Pāda Vandanāva' at Lakminipalaṅga Press, which narrated the irksome journey to Śrī Pāda by foot, starting from Galkapanavatta. One who is conversant with the 'naḍē guru' or guide of a pilgrimage to sacred cities, who was a familiar figure two decades ago in every remote village in Ceylon, will realise how the poet is making attempts to fulfil that role of a 'naḍē guru' to the 'kōḍu' and

73. It is a sign of disrespect, according to the belief.

'kirikōḍu', the first time goes to Śrī Pāda. He advised the pilgrims of places to eat, to get a bath, to sleep, to rest, and places where they have to beware of thieves. At the end of the poem, the poet printed the Pali stanzas and benedictory verses in Sinhalese to be recited at the peak. Any reader who bought the book would undoubtedly easily reach the sacred place. See how the poet introduces the pilgrim to a friend of his at Māgaltoṭa.

"Surabiyel Appuhāmy dāka neta ṭa
mage mekal siyalu suvaḍuk kiyā siṭa". 73
(Meet Surabiyel Appuhāmy and tell him about me.)

Kālaṇiya, another sacred site of the Buddhists, also supplied subject matter to 'Rajamaha Kālaṇi Utpattiya' in 1896. The significance of Anurādhapura was caught belatedly by the leaders of the B.T.S and M.B.S. But before that the poets and ordinary people had discovered the importance of this place to the Buddhists of the Island. 'Anurādhapura Alankāraya' of A.S.Kannangara was printed at the Industrial School Press in Kandy in 1887. The poet who started from Kandy with his wife has described his journey in this poem, giving details and instructions to the future pilgrims to Anurādhapura. The inadequacy of the book as a literary piece was admitted by the author. (mē pota śāstra mārgayaṭa ekaṅga nāti namut).

73.K.R.Perera, Samanala Gamana,(1890),verse 19, p.3.

Ruvanvāli Sāya, another important place in the same city, was described in 'Ruvanvāli Vistaraya' of K.R. Perera, printed by Vilpiṭa Vickramageyi Don Andiris Appuhāmy in 1892, which ran to a second edition in 1897. To instruct the pilgrims to Śrī Mahā Bōdhi, 'Navaka Bōdhi Vandanāva' of M.S.Fernando was printed in 1895 at Sarasvatī Press. S.P., a businessman, and R.S., a native physician from Potupitiya, went on a pilgrimage in the train and the poet narrated the trip giving the readers the opportunity to learn the way to reach the site.

'Attanagalla' where Sirisaṅgabō, a righteous king in Ceylon, offered his head to a poor man, was the subject of description in two poems. D.W.Vaniganetti Appuhāmy in 1897 published 'Attanagalu Vihāra Vamśa Kavi Pota' attributed to a nāyaka thera called 'Gñānaratana, and K.R.Perera too printed 'Attanagalu Upata' in the same year.

Religious festivals and meritorious acts which were performed individually or collectively were described in poems by these new poets. Doḍandūva, it seems, was a place where a competitive mood prevailed on religious festivals at temples. Maggona Gurunnānsēlāgē Manuel Fernando died on 12.11.1881, leaving us his work on a religious festival

at Śailabimbārāmaya, namely 'Doḍandūvē Pinkam Varṇanāva' which was printed in 1889. The publisher estimated the standard of knowledge of the poet in his introductory statement,⁷⁴ and the poet confirms the fact in his book by saying:

"bāsen sinhala puluvanvā misa viyaranayak nāta mama dannā
kāṭat tērum gānumaṭa puluvan hāṭiyaṭa kavikara pavasannā" ⁷⁵
(I know only the language of Sinhalese but not its
grammar. I compose these verses to be understood by all.)

A poet of the Southern province versified 'Punya karma Alankāraya', a description of a religious festival held in 1889 at Kumāra Mahā Vihāraya, and printed the book at Vidyāprakāśa Press at Doḍandūva. The newly built temple was described at length, with the people who praised the decorations. In these descriptions one can easily note the influence of 'Gangārōhaṇa Varṇanāva'. This same festival is described by Karlin D'Alwis with 48 verses in 'Doḍandūvē Kumāra Mahā Vihārayē Pinkam Varṇanāva' in the same year. The inevitable influence of Gangārōhaṇa Varṇanāva is well shown even in this work. Sometimes it is hard to recite lines like the following which is unequally composed.

74. ' mē siyallama kelē vyākaranādiya dānīmē śaktiyakin nova
potpat balā purudden saha jammayen vāgē pihiṭā tibuna
śaktiyenutya'.

75. M.G.M. Fernando, Doḍandūvē Pinkam Varṇanāva, (1889), verse 5,
p. 1.

"solō kāviyan pot ganimin tāna tāna iṇḍa kiyannō
hallo, that is well done kiyamin dat pā sināven vesennō" ⁷⁶

A religious festival organised by N.S.Fernando and D.C.Pedris, two ardent Buddhist Theosophists, at their native place in Dangedara near Galle, was versified by C.Don Bastian in 'Dangedara Punyakarmāḷankāraya' and printed at Lakdiv Press, in 1891. This was known as 'Kav Mini Barana' since it is the only composition of this time which is full of poetic riddles such as 'Kavāṭa Bandhana' and 'Gōmutrikā'. Mythically Viśvakarma is believed to be the creator of all beautiful things of the world. Here the poet happily says the decorations of Dangedara people are like those of the sons of Viśvakarma.

" viskam pāṭav men mē dana kalā lolā
atkam aruma lesa ē tāna kalā balā" ⁷⁷

When on 14.2.1892, Harmānis Nānāyakkāra, a native physician of Demaṭagoḍa, prepared a procession with the villagers to go to Subhadrārāmaya, Vālikāḍa, K.R.Perera composed 'Pelahara Alankāraya' and printed it in 1892. In this small work which consists of only 25 verses, one will see grammatically how incorrect is the language employed by the poet. The two terms 'vāṇḍa' and 'avasara'

76.M.G.M.Fernando, op.cit, verse 42, p.5.

77.C.D.Bastian,Kav Mini Barana, verse 12, p.3.

in 'vāṇḍavasara' in verse 22 can not be combined in this way in the Sinhalese language and the joining of 'varun' after 'saṅga' in 'esaṅgavarun' is also wrong. Note how the poet mixes the active and passive voices incorrectly in 'mama visina kīvemi', in the verse 24.

M.D.Kornēlis Fonseka described the Pirit chanting ceremony at Āvarivatte temple, in Raygam Kōralē, in 'Mahavila Āvarivattē Pinkam Varṇanāva', printed in 1893. When the priests started to chant the 'great Sūtras' the women afflicted by demons were, he says, vigorously dancing and screaming, which seldom occurs at the present day.

"eviṭa yakun vāḥilā un aṅganō
hoṇḍaṭa naṭā hū kiyamin hāpunō" (verse 40).

A religious festival which took place at Abhinavārāmaya, Vaskaḍuva, where Subhūti nāyaka thera lived, was described in verse by V.H.De Soyza Samarasēkara, a pupil of Tangallē Vimalānanda thera, whose teacher was Tuḍāvē Paṇḍita, in 1894 as 'Abhinavārāma Varṇanāva'. The book was written during a single week and contains gī, silō and sivpada metres. When compared with other creations of the Mīripānnē school, this work can not be considered as a worthwhile contribution to that tradition.

The religious festival connected with the procession of Āsala, this time not at a Buddhist temple but at the temple of God Viṣṇu at Devundara, was described in 'Kav Mini Dapana' of A.W.Gunasekara in 1894. Temporary shops were built by the wayside and a foreign woman queries the prices of some goods. The poet reported the event in this manner.

"That is nice' kiyamin risi lesi nā- āsu
'what is price' kiyamin mila hasi nā"(verse 138).

Don Kornēlis Fonseka versified the meritorious acts, such as pilgrimages, religious festivals, and participation in various activities of Dediya vela Sangharakkhita nāyaka therā of Colombo in 'Pinkiriya Vata' in 1891. After narrating the childhood of the priest the poet described how with difficulty he went twice to Śrī Pāda, twice to Anurādhapura and once to Kālaniya. This is the only composition we have of this period which discusses an individual's religious acts.

The religious controversies of the consecrated boundary, and the re-receiving of the upasampadā by the priests of the Amarapura sect aroused the feelings of poets and in two poems written in 1893, namely 'Sankara Kurullā' and 'Dalhī Karma Haṭanaya', the Āmbagahapiṭṭiyē temple at Vālitara was severely criticised.

As we have noted in the second chapter, when the bhikkhus were struggling for eminence of their sects the lay devotees became more entangled in religious affairs, which was not a characteristic of earlier times. 'Mōkṣa Dānaya' composed and printed by S.G.M.Pabilis Gunavardhana in 1893 which mercilessly ridiculed the present state of Buddhism in Ceylon was a fine example of this new wave. The author, who lived in an especial apartment called 'dharma śālāva' at Maṇḍāvala, preached against the existing theories of Maitreya, the future Buddha, and said that anyone could reach the higher states of mind in this birth and if he tried more could even attain Nibbāna. This was followed by a serious attack on Pabilis Gunavardhana, called 'Durjana Prahāra Yama Tīnduva'.

"vanaguddana libipas nam umatu yakek lakāṭa pāmīna
guna set dena teruvan nāta kiyamin ravaṭā muludana"(verse5).
(An insane demon called vanaguddana libipas (or Gunavadda-
-na Pabilis) has arrived in Ceylon and is preaching
against the Triple Gem and deceiving people.)

S.P. Perera's 'Rāmañña Vāda Bhangaya' printed first in 1893 ran to a second edition in 1895, and was the most serious attack met by the leading bhikkhus of the Rāmañña sect. Their defeat at the controversy at Baṭapatē was

illustrated at the end. Uḍugampola Suvannajoti was accused as a thief of religious texts from a temple at Kospillāva. 'vāsa Kospillāvē bana pot horakam kara sāṅgavī giya undā pasupassē luhubāṇḍa āllū kala vāṇḍa pudalā gālavī undā' (When he was caught on the way with the stolen books from the temple at Kospillāva, he worshipped the people and was freed after that.)

When some bhikkhus of the Siamese sect approved eating meat by Buddhist priests, Hanumā (Gurunnānsēlāgē Don Pālis Appuhāmy) composed 'Māmsa Vāda Tīranaya' in 1893. It was written as a ritual and most of the composition was devoted to benedictory verses.

'bella kapā aja gavayin yōnakayō maranā
alla hilallā ē pav duru kere himi kiyānā
nalla nalla kiyamin ē masa āra gena budinā
bella ugura pāmini dōsa adinma at hārenā' (verse 21).

(Since goats and cattle are killed by the Muslims, the sin has fallen on their God, say the Buddhist priests, and they eat that meat saying 'how nice it is'. May all the maladies of the neck and throat be warded off.)

Lay devotees it appears thought that poetry was a more powerful way to express their feelings on religious controversies. At Gandara when the controversy on a boundary and on alms came up, poetical works such as 'Ali Māle', 'Kalu Siliṇḍu Katāva', 'Dumbara Mahabinikmana'

and 'Dumbara Saṅgabata' ⁷⁸ were printed and distributed anonymously by a group. Though these books are lost now, we can infer that caste affiliations too played a great role in these compositions. As a reply to all these appeared 'Gandara Adāniyel Pralāpa Katura' of A.L.D.A. Kurukularatna, in 1895. The poet after tracing the history of the newly erected boundary at Gandara made attempts to defend the caste of Dumbara Saranankara, since he was accused as a man of 'Padu' caste.

'nāmen paduvōma tamayi baninā aya dahama balana
 sīlen samvara āti saṅganata padu nam kiya mina'(verse142).
 (Those who refer to righteous bhikkhus as 'padu' are
 themselves people of Padu caste, according to religious
 teachings.)

A few versified biographies of some of the famous leading Buddhist priests and lesser known bhikkhus of that time who inspired contemporary society in the religious field were printed during this period. The life of Yōgiyānē Nandārāmatissa of Nākulugamuva, a comparatively unknown monk, who must have been a local leader of the area, was composed by Siri Sumedhatissa of the Amarapura sect and this 'Naṇḍaram Tera Vata' was printed at Sarasavi Saṇḍarāsa press in 1894.

78. All these books are mentioned in the introduction of 'Gandara Adāniyel Pralāpa Katura' but I have not seen any of them.

When Jinavaravamsa, who made a futile attempt to set up a United Sect of the bhikkhus in 1897, first entered the order of bhikkhus in Ceylon, that event was made the subject of a poem called 'Siyam Rājakumāra Pāvidi Vata' in 1896 by A.P.Idirisinha. Note the language employed by the poet to introduce a modern prince.

'vitara nuvanin igena nonivaṭa samat vī Ingirisi bāseṭa pavara samatek velā ṭaiṭel labā gati sit vū vilāseṭa'⁷⁹

A constantly used classical simile used infelicitously can be seen in the following line where the poet compares the single prince to the Ocean of milk.

'esaṇḍa kumarā lakal piviture sētamaya kirisayura vāgē'

The life of the chief incumbent of Suvisuddhārāmaya, Mādampē, a relatively insignificant figure in the religious activities of the period, was versified after his death by S.D.S.Jayaratna in 'Kav Kirula' and was printed at Vidyāratnākara press at Vālitara. The funeral was described at length.

Lankāgoḍa Dhīrānanda, the originator of the Sīmā Samkara Vādāya which disrupted the Amarapura sect was eulogised by Mādampē Dhammatilaka therā in 'Kav Lakara'. The death of the hero occurred in 1870 but the book was printed in 1890, by G.D.Kornēlis Appuhāmy. This work has

79.A.P.Idirisinha, Siyam Rājakumāra Pāvidi Vata, verse 5, p.1.

to be considered as a clever piece of poetical writing of this time, since it came from the pen of a disciple of the Mīripānnē school. The author elegantly followed the classical language in his work.

'sirilaka sasunaṃbara dadarada yuru sarada
sirilaka sudana mana koṇḍa naṇḍa dun arada'⁸⁰

From verse 49 he started the career of Lankāgoḍa, after tracing the establishment of the Daḍalla branch of the Amarapura sect by Kapugama, who later became a mudliar. Varied metres were skilfully employed by the poet. Apart from the longest metre of 52 matras, he used very original metres which will enhance the beauty in recitation of those verses. A metre consisting of 22 syllabic instants was used by him which creates a beautiful image of the scene the poet is describing. It has to be read with four caesural pauses, after six, six, six and four mātrās respectively.

'genemin baḍu- nedesin ena- sedanan nāv - siya lē
pavanin nāṅgi-taraṅgin niti-sālemin pura- asa lē'(verse 61)

The life of Mohoṭṭivattē Gunānanda, the most important indefatigable leader of the Buddhists during this revivalistic period, has been the subject for two versifications. K.R.Perera in 51 verses related the part

80.M.Dhammatilaka, Kav Lakara, (1890), verse 2, p.1.

played by Gunānanda at the Pānadura controversy and his funeral in 'Gunanañdana Vata' in 1890. Rev. David De Silva is nicknamed 'kalu balalā' (black cat) and in the description of the controversy one will find the same sentiments as those aroused by Gunānanda in attacking Christians. The Christian priests were described with terms like 'nivaṭa, kālakanni, kudiṭu, pādili rālahāmy'. The old women who gather to watch the controversy were described in a peculiar way which can be called inappropriate.

'inḍa iḍamak nātuva soyamin pāpol sē piyayuruda elliyo'

The comparison of the sagging breasts of old women to papaw fruit which grows firmly is unsuitable and the popular idiom in these places was 'vāṭakolu'. Concerning the language, K.R. Perera used animate suffixes with inanimate objects in places like 'siyalu vāḍayan' and 'sādu nadayan'. He tells how he felt the departure of Mohoṭṭivattē priest, as did most of the ordinary Buddhists of that time who had witnessed his career, and how after coming home from the funeral with his eyes full of tears he versified his life for the press.

Another interesting work, 'Layānvita Sōka Mālāva' of Srimāna Araccigē Jusē Perera, also described the death of Gunānanda. It is ironical to witness how the events connected with such a Buddhist leader who acted all his life against the Christians were versified into

the tunes employed by the Christian Church. 'duk gītikāva, vilāpa sinduva, duk kannalavva, duk aṇḍōnāva, layānvita gāyanāva and kīrti gāyanāva' which appeared in the hymn books of the Christian church were slavishly and blindly imitated to describe the life of Mohoṭṭivattē. One would not be surprised to hear someone saying 'Amen' at the end of this line:

'supasan dina kituvarusa ekvādahas aṭasiya anūvē Sāptāmbara masa visiekvāni din ema dina pāminīlā- apaṭa mē duk dīlā paralova vāḍi Gunānanda svāmī, ay ayyō mev dayābara mē oba dakimu koyi kālē'

At the beginning, the proclamation of Vesak as a public holiday in 1884, it seems, did not stir the talents of the new poets of this period. To establish a special significance for Vesak day, a hectic propagandist movement was launched by the Buddhist Theosophists. Five years after the proclamation (only did the poets even make attempts to versify the new decorations and religious affairs on Vesak day. They also were poets who doubtless had some connection with the Theosophist movement and to some extent they too were responsible for the propaganda to boost Olcott as the great architect of this religious and social event.

'Siddhārtha Kumārōdaya Varṇanāva' of P.J.Perera, in 1888, 'Pānadurē Vaiśāka Mangalya Varṇanāva' in 1889,

'Cētiya Utpattiya', 'Vesak Pūjāva' and 'Siduhat Alamkāraya' in 1893 were poetical works devoted to the descriptions of successive Vesak days. Olcott was mentioned in these poems and in their Carol songs as the person who prepared the Vesak as a public holiday.

'pin kala muniraja ipaduna dina dāna garutara Olcott

mätivaranā

gambira lesa kaṭayutu kara gannaṭa nivāḍu dina salasā

dunnā'

'nānin saru vu Olcott māti Karnel

dunin labā menivāḍu dina suvisal'. 81

This new Vesak was exploited by publishers, press owners and businessmen in Colombo, with the assistance of poets. Vesak cards were printed with verses on them and with the printers there was a stock of verses which could be sold separately with cards. The imported Vesak lanterns were accompanied by Sinhalese verses. The lighting of lanterns was transferred into a ritualistic procedure and 'Cētiya Utpattiya' describes how to perform this ritual. With the lanterns the verse also has to be hung up. When decorations were bought from the shop the buyer automatically received the verse to paste on them. When a 'dansāla' was erected a verse has to be written there. Thus the poet's services became essential for the

81. F.F., Pānadurē Vaisāka Mangalya Varṇanāva, (1889).

new Vesak day celebrations. But for his services the composer gained not money but bundles of Vesak cards printed by the press. Some press owners took care to send the poet the cards only after the Vesak. A great number of such verses written by Albert Silva on Vesak is now in the possession of Mullapitiyē K.H.De.Silva Vijayaśrīvardhana Muhandiram Rālahāmy.

With the appearance of 'Siddhārtha Kumārōdaya Varṇanāva', 'Siduhat Alamkāraya' and 'Sarvagña Prīti Gōṣāva', a new metrical tradition was introduced in Sinhalese. These compositions were written in accordance with the Hindustani musical tunes which came to Ceylon with the theatrical companies from India. By this time a considerable number of Sinhalese theatrical companies in Colombo had adopted this musical system, although they had no scientific training or knowledge of the system. 'Rājā hūm may kaumakā' in the play called 'Indar Sabhā' was a popular model among these writers. The sensitive musical ear of the Sinhalese writers realised the greater popularity of the fast moving, though unintelligible sound system in Hindustani musical tunes, over the slow rhythms in Sinhalese poetry. Such a song composed along the lines of the above mentioned Hindustani song is thus:

'budu vū tilōguru apa muniñdā- ipadunu mē dinayē-
 enisā api sāma boho santosa vī- ehi gos dān vañdimū'.⁸²

The foregoing discussion of the poetical works based on religious tales and contemporary religious events will exhibit clearly how this new group of poets enriched and expanded the limitations of the existing poetical tradition by adding a vividness to the subject matter and exploiting new metres to express themselves, although their standard of knowledge in the Sinhalese language was not so high as that of their predecessors. The remaining few poems associated with contemporary social events will enlighten us more on these lines.

Exploration of contemporary social activities was hardly known to the classical Sinhalese poets and Mīripānnē Dhammaratana can be considered as the pioneer who exploited the occurrences and happenings of the surroundings in which he lived as the subject matter of his compositions. Before 1875, we have discussed the few attempts to deal with contemporary events by the poets of the new generation. After that we have a considerable number of poems based on social happenings in the last quarter of the century. These poets have versified contemporary events and sometimes personal experiences
 82. Sarvagña Prīti Gōṣāva, (1893).

in which they themselves have participated. The poetical works of this nature, which had first emerged as printed poems in 1867, were expanded and diversified by the poets of this period.

'Kalla Mālaya' of Kornēlis Disānāyaka related the story of a young girl at Adduvāna who pretended an attack of hysteria with the idea of getting married soon. When the young daughter seemed afflicted with illnesses such as shivering of the body, insistence of sleeping on the ground, laughing, tearing her clothes and staring at people, the parents invited an old exorcist to perform a ritual. The approach of the old man and the reaction of the girl towards him is described humorously by the poet, using words as they would come out from a toothless mouth.

'bokoda hābiḍe apaṭa eḍḍaṭa pavivuḍē' for 'mokoda hāmine apaṭa ennaṭa panivuḍē' and 'bāki baṭṭa ahaḍḍēḍāti jakeṭṭava āṭuvāḍa bē raṭa' for 'mā ki mantara ahaṇṇē nāti yakek tava āṭuvāḍa mē raṭa', are examples (of that). After his failure a young exorcist arrived on the scene and performed a 'Sanni Yakuma' ceremony, in the name of 'Kalla Yakā', an imaginary demon of the poet, and the girl was cured.

C. Don Bastian, the first Nurti writer in Sinhalese imitating the Indian drama which was performed in Ceylon in the eighties, who led a miserable life with no sound economic position, at the wedding of his friend, Mīgamu

Gurunnānsēlāgē Don Hendrick, in 1889, offered him 'Kalana Mitu Ruvana' with 18 verses eulogising him and the bride, as a present, and on the occasion of the marriage of Dōna Engaltinā Hevavitarana, daughter of Don Karolis and Isabela Perera Dharmagunavardhana, and the sister of Dharmapala, C. Don Bastian, who was an uncle of the bride, presented her with 'Ovā Mutuhara' in the same year. Another wedding feast, that of Mutukumarasvami with Kamini Ramanathan, was versified by Heṭṭiyakandagē John Andrew Fernando in 'Mangalya Vata' in 1893.

Not only the marriages but also the deaths of relatives were described by the poets of that time. Rev. C. W. De Silva lamented over his wife in 'Śōka Vivaranaya' while N. Simon Dias printed 'Śōkōdaya' on the death of his seven months old cousin in 1891.

The virtuous lives of their friends also were versified on certain occasions by the poets. G. H. Perera, the editor of Dinakara Prakāśaya, was eulogised for his service to the nation, in 1892, in the poem called 'Pāsasum Hara' and Rev. R. S. Copleston, bishop of Colombo, was presented with an address in verse at Nūpe School by D. B. Nāgasinha in 1897.

While these socially benevolent personalities were praised in this manner, the personal characteristics of a few crooks were also attacked in poems of this time.

'Veda Haṭane' of V.M.D.V.Jeronis relates the dishonest life of B.D.Dines De Silva who deceived the villagers as an expert native physician although possessing only one type of capsule called 'Ratnādi Guliya' in 1891. I came across two copies of the same book printed in that year, one of the second edition and the other of the fifth edition. If so this book ran for four editions in one year, which is a sign of the popularity of this poem. Telā of Hunupitiya was warned against the disgraceful sexual lives of his family in 'Tel Haṭane' in the same year.

'hiragedaradi guṭi bāṭa kā gū bāldi ādde nādda
 kulamala āti topaṭa noveda mehema dōsa venṭa nādda
 vilibiya nāti tope kuḍamma durāvekut gatte nādda
 para hivalā dānagena hiṭu min matu taṭa vena asudda'(42).
 (Did not you do the low caste menial work at the prisons?
 Isn't it disgraceful to see your mother's sister living
 with a man of Durāve caste? Now be careful you fellow.)

'Uḍaṅgu Mardanaya' or the story of Denihīnā, which criticised the life of a man who neglected the traditional social values like respecting his parents, after coming to Colombo as a servant boy, was printed in 1892. The life of Jusē Appu, a marriage broker, is related in Vimaladaspiya's 'Jusē Appu Nam Magulakapuvāgē Caritaya' in 1896, a composition which has not deteriorated to the levels of the other personal attacks we have discussed here. Jusē Appu, an eccentric individual from Henaratgoda, while serving

in Colombo as a servant fell in love with a girl and after marriage led her into prostitution. After some time he entered the Buddhist order and later the Christian order and eventually became a layman again and started a career in marriage-making. In this work one can note various activities in Sinhalese society as a result of the work of the B.T.S such as 'condemnation of European dresses, European customs and manners and taking Aryan names'.

Apart from these poems dealing with personal involvements, some versifications connected with social gatherings, folk rituals and games were also published by the presses of this time. 'Uncillā Vārama', an original work but a poor and incorrectly written poem, was printed in 1885. A line which contains 16 syllabic instants has four caesural sections of equal length in recitation of a normal 'vāram' verse, but these verses can not be recited in that manner.

'Daru Nālavilla' of T.Bastian Silva, an exorcist, which was printed in 1889, was a new composition which imitated the lullaby scene in a 'Raṭa Yakum' ceremony. 'Sokari Katāva' too describes the story enacted in a folk ritual, after the harvesting season. Albert Silva's 'Pandu Keliya' skilfully describes the game called pandu, very similar to cricket.

A gathering of a national level is the Sinhalese New Year day which falls on the 13 th of April. The customs

to be adhered to on this day and the following day were related in 'Avurudu Mālaya' of T.Bastian Silva in 1891, and 'Sinhala Avurudu Mangalya' of S.A.Jusē Perera in 1892.

Women in the Sinhalese society were a less respected group, neglected by poets and literary men. They were victimised and succumbed to disgrace on account of their alleged feebleness, stupidity and wickedness, but at this time a few poets and also poetesses have eulogised women as intelligent personalities. 'Aṅgana Guna Dapana' of N.C.Silva Hāminē, was printed in 1894. The poetess, who could not bear the humiliations and accusations levelled against women in most places, went far beyond the limits of decency. She even said that if she were appointed as the creator of the world she would create the male organ between the mouth and the nose.

"aṅganannuguna pamanak kiyana tira kara
pirimin kaṭa ilena lesa niti mada māṇḍura
ladi nam yam dineka maṭa baṁbahu tanatura
mavanem pumaliṅguva un kaṭa nāhā atara" (verse 7).

'Anganōpadēśaya' or 'the way to be an excellent wife' by F.W.M.Karunaratna was printed in 1891. The intelligence of women is narrated by U.A.D.William Appuhāmy in 'Itiri Nāna Abilasa', a confused tale in which the reader can hardly discover the actual events. The chastity of women was generally a matter of argument among Sinhalese

writers but the exemplary character of women in that field is related in 'Bhāminī Carita Darpanaya' of M.D.T. Gunaratna, in 1887.

Life in prison, which had never before appeared in a Sinhalese poem, was described by two prisoner poets in two compositions under the same title, 'Sipiri Mālaya', in 1888. Both poets who suffered in the prisons advised their readers to refrain from crimes. The officers in the prisons were English and they trained the prisoners to a new way of life. One poet describes a morning like this;

"etakoṭa pota genat jailor tāna balalā

 dakunaṭa yanta kivuveya right turn kiyalā" (verse 50)

"vamin yanta kivu left turn kiyā maṭa" (verse 51).

In these two poems the first person narration method is used, which gives a powerful impression to the reader that he is reading a genuine experience of prisoners.

During the British occupation when railways and main roads were constructed uniting all the main cities, (the) ease of communication became obvious to the ordinary people of the Island. But a vehicle was an unimaginable luxury to the poor and they preferred to walk. To instruct these pedestrians, poets versified the recognisable places on the main roads. 'Mārga Sankhyāva' of D.O. De Silva printed in 1887 describes the milestones from Colombo to Kandy. Anyone who has the book in his

hand easily follows the route to Kandy.

"ahara nisā māvata yana ena sēnā
 dahara lamayi iṇḍa kelinā kavaṭa sinā
 pāra depasa gama māda niti jana vasaṇā
 Mahara balan navayē kanuva sari unā"

(People are constantly shopping on the road and small children are playing and cracking jokes. The wayside village is heavily populated, and here at Mahara you have passed the ninth mile post.)

In 1892 Harmānis Perera published 'Mārga Vistaraya', a description of a trip from Fort of Galle to Mariyākaḍē in Colombo with his wife, and supplied the necessary instructions to the readers on their way. The places where the 56 mile-posts are situated along the main road from Colombo to Ratnapura are described by K.R.Perera in another 'Mārga Vistaraya' in 1891. Colombo, the capital city of the Island, was a mystery to the ordinary villagers at that time. M.H.A.Perera in 'Koloṃba Vistaraya' printed in 1896 described the whole city, illustrating the public places of interest to ordinary people, and he introduced his work as 'a mother to those who come to Colombo'. 'Kav Mutu Vāla' of John Perera Vīrasēkara narrates the stations on the rail road to Kandy from Colombo; it was printed in 1887 as a posthumous work. One wonders whether these poems

have influenced the education system in geography of Ceylonese schools of two decades ago, where the students were asked to name from memory the place names between two destinations.

Dharmapala Hevavitarana was a leader who insisted on a reform of dress. But with D.B.Jayatilaka, the appointed president of the Dress Reform Society, ⁸³ constantly wearing the European suit one could hardly imagine a worthy outcome. So they preferred to reform not the dress of men but that of women, and at that time jackets with wide neck-line were criticised by S.P.in 'Kara Palal Hāṭṭaya' written in the form of a dialogue between Luvisa Hāmi and Misi Nānā.

The term 'haṭane' employed by the poets in some of the previously discussed works had certainly no connection with the classical 'war poems' or 'haṭan kāvya', a sub-division of the panegyric poems in Sinhalese. They were merely personal abuse of people the poets disliked. Some other versifications which used the term 'haṭane' during this period, however, resemble the earlier type of haṭan poems and were written in considerable accordance with the canons of traditional haṭan kāvya.

83. The first meeting of this Society was held on 19.12. 1894 at Floral Hall.
 The Buddhist , Vol.6, No.45, p.356,
 The Buddhist , Vol.6, No.49, p.379.

'Sūdu Haṭanaya' of K.R.Perera printed in 1893 praised John Kotalavala, a police inspector, while describing his adventures to curb the disorderly behaviour of Colombo city. After narrating the prosecutions of illicit arrack sellers and the thieves of Henaratgoda post office the poet described the arrest of one Neyinā and his assistants, the major operation of Kotalavala in his capacity as a government official, after searching the famous gambling spot at Masangas Handiya. Finally the poet considered his own suitability to be the king of Ceylon under the Queen of England!

'Marakkala Haṭane' of E.Paulis Fernando and 'Kaṭugampola Haṭanaya' of C.Perera, printed in 1891 and 1892 respectively described two 'wars' between two contemporary rival groups. After a young carpenter of Karāwe caste from Moraṭuva eloped with a young Muslim girl in Colombo, the Muslims invaded Moraṭuva in search of the girl, and after hearing the news Muslims in all parts of the Island were attacked and looted by Sinhalese and the Police had to intervene for peace. The feelings of Sinhalese against Muslims were the result of the nationalistic trade policy of the Sinhalese new rich class and the poet of 'Marakkala Haṭanaya' severely criticised the Muslims on this ground. Pallēgama Banda and C.Gunaratna of Kaṭugampola became rivals over a land case and while the proceedings at the

courts were going on these two parties had a gunfight and some were killed. 'Kaṭugampola Haṭane' describes this 'war' or 'haṭane'.

With the advent of money the villagers in greed for a few rupees sent their young daughters to Colombo as maids in houses, and through sheer ignorance of city life they became the prey of young deceivers. 'Kupāḍi Haṭane' of V.Karōlis Appu and 'Āyāsōka Mālaya' of J.A printed in 1892 and 1893 narrate the plight of young women who come to town as maids.

The temperance movement in Ceylon was started by the Christian priests and not by the Buddhists. Two poems under the same title 'Surā Soṇḍa Sandēśaya' were written by Rev.C.W.De Silva and Rev.J.F.Corea. The former was a contemporary work and the latter which was first serialised in 1851 was edited and completed by Albert Silva in 1893.

The caste sentiments which emerged during this time also enriched the new poetical tradition with some versifications on caste. The struggle for superiority was fought between the Karāwe and Govigama castes. Mahākavi Śrī Vanigśēkara's 'Itihāsa Mūlōcchēdaniya', Śrī Kālinga Mahākavi's 'Kaṣṭa Durālāpa Prahāraya', 'Jātivādaya', 'Jātivāda Vighātaniya', 'Jātivāda Mardanaya', 'Jātivāda Mardana Varṇanāva', 'Elu Balu Pota' were printed

in 1885, while 'Sinhala Kula Puvata' of S.Alwis was printed in 1886. Since most of these works were written as attacks on the Karāwe caste, C.H.De Soysa became the target of serious criticisms from Govigama writers and he was hailed by the writers of his own caste. In 1889 when his two daughters M.Francis Mary Soysa and Jane M.C Soysa, composed 'Muva Kavudu Sival Katāva' and 'Gaja Sival Katāva' under the instructions of Tambiappu Gurunnānsē, they received nearly two hundred letters in praise of the works. The writers of Govigama caste were furious over this matter and Engaltinā Kumāriya wrote 'Kāvya Vajrāyudhaya' criticising the effort of two ladies.

'gena basa Tambiappuge saha Vāligoma gē
yasa rāsa makā gati Soysā mātiñduhu gē'

To console C.H.De Soysa after these criticisms on his daughters, Sangharatana, a priest, composed 'Gē Kurulu Sandēśaya'. This was a message sent from Kahañdāmōdara to Charles Henry De Soysa Dharmagunavardhana Vipula Jayasuriya Karunaratna Disanayaka of Kollupitiya, praising the two poems. This is the only original Sandēśa poem written in this period; it is a poor imitation of earlier Sandēśa works.

The life of C.H.De Soysa was narrated after his death in 1891, by M.P.N.W.V.Kurē of Pānadura in 'Kav Mini Sayura'. He employed the classical language in his

work.

"kurukulāmbara muduna pun sasādara yuruva
samakula dana samaga ekatuva met saruva"(verse 2).

Even when the poet narrates the life of a staunch Christian he could not evade the influence of Buddhist sayings which he found in other Sinhalese poems. The rabid dog who bit Soysa is compared to a demon sent by Vasavarti Māra as in the case of Lord Buddha.

"susiritē piri mātindu veta Vasavatā kōpava napuraṭā
rudu sitē vama evū rakusakuyāyi sitē dān apa haṭā"(109).

While the expansion of subject matter was thus continued by these poets, the metre also faced sudden developments in the hands of these new poets. As mentioned earlier, (the) Indian Musical melodies became very popular at this time among some writers. 'Rāga Sindu Maldama' of M.B.Perera printed in 1887, 'Rāga Sindu Pota' of D.P.R printed in 1888 and 'Ovā Gīta Mālaya' of J.S.Jayatilaka printed in 1889 show this. The term 'rāga' in these titles is connected with Indian music. The term 'sindu' is less clear. In works like 'Pavana' and 'Śrī Nāmaya' we see a type of rhythmical verses called 'mudrappada sindu' and there exists a poem of an unknown date called 'Vēdēha Sinduva', but the term 'sinduva' in these places is hardly to be associated with these new compositions.

We are not in a position to trace the origin of the old indigeneous 'sindu' metre of traditional poets.

To the Hindustani tunes were added 'Kapiriñña', 'Cikōtti' and 'Bailā', various types of popular songs in imitation of European musical rhythms. Since Portuguese, Dutch and English were living in the towns, these writings must have been the creations of writers who had heard such songs. 'Kapiriñña Pota' which was printed in 1885 gives an idea of these new rhythms.

'atana metana kotana	giyā
kalet aran liñḍaṭa	giyā
liñḍa vaṭa kara kabara	goyā
kakula kāpi diyabari	yā'
'āyā magē pa	nē
āyāgē ḍabal	tanē
allannaṭa hitayi	anē
bāruvāṭa mokoda	anē'. 84

'Āyā Kapiriñña' and 'Māyam Peraliya' of K.A.D. Perera printed in 1893 are also written in accordance with these new rhythms. We are not in a position to discuss further in this field, but one can certainly note that some of the modern pop singers in Ceylon have derived inspiration from these writings in their compositions and in the way they sing. Certainly they have never read these writings, but they must have

heard verses of this type sung by some urban neighbour, who must have got them from the previous generation.

All the compositions we have discussed until now were written prior to 1900 and in the remaining years of our period up to 1906 we encounter a slack time in the new poetical tradition in Sinhalese. After 1900 there appears a setback when compared to the pre-1900 period of the poets who enriched the new tradition of poetry. All the presses issued reprints of (the) poetical works already published. We can note that only a small field of the contemporary society was subjected to versification during this six year period. Why religious affairs were ignored by the poets of this time can not be explained.

The caste controversies were carried on without cessation between Karāwe and Govigama groups. In 1901 the Vahumpura caste also were added to the controversy, when N.S.Fernando's appointment as a Mudliar was ridiculed by Battaramullē Subhūti under the name Mahākavi Rājasinha in 'Sirit Maldama' in 1901. It was replied to by Albert Silva in 'Sirit Maldam Khandanaya'. Mahāsēna of Kataragama attacked Albert Silva, his parents and the publisher in 'Sirit Maldam Khandana Vāda Khandanaya' in the same year. 'Śudra Pralāpa Sanhāraya', and 'Śudra Varṇa Prahāraya' were printed

in 1904 against the Karāwe caste.

The temperance movement borrowed from the Christian Church was naturalised and organised as a Sinhalese Buddhist movement grounded on villages to develop the nation and the country by P.A.Silva of Bandāravatta, a native gentleman of Salāgama caste. Unfortunately his name was maliciously swept away from the memories of the nation by the new lay leaders who took over the movement to protect their own interests, covering it with a garb of hypocrisy. His name is now completely forgotten owing to the propaganda of the new lay leaders, but at that time P.A.Silva was a formidable/powerful leader of an overwhelming movement in Ceylon, as is proved by the innumerable pamphlets and booklets written on him and his movement by contemporary poets. 'Surā Mugura' of a modern 'Gajaman Nōnā', 'Surā Mudgaraya', 'Surā Rakusu Haṭṭana', 'Amadyapāna Caritaya', 'Surāsoṇḍa Caritaya' of Albert Silva, 'Lankā Surā Yuddhaya' of P.P.Jayavardhana, 'Surā Baliya' of D.E.D.S.Jayasuriya, 'Surā Dōṣa Sangrahava', 'Madyapānādīnava' of W.A.De Silva, 'Madya Dōṣa Parīkṣāva', 'Madya Pāna Vilāpaya' and a new 'Surāsoṇḍa Sandēśa' were printed in 1904. Some poets expressed their wish to witness P.A.Silva as a future Buddha. 'Surā Upata' and 'Surā Vipata' of R.Dharmasēna were printed in 1905. We can note how not only toddy, but also other foreign

liquors are included in the list of intoxicants in 'Surāsoṇḍa Caritaya' of Albert Silva.

'gaṇḍin yut arakkuda rā	surāmaya
Wine Gin Brandy Whisky da	surāmaya
ganan Champagne Rum ā	surāmaya
durin duru karata hot mema	surāmaya', ⁸⁵

When the temperance movement embraced Sinhalese society, overpowering all the other religious activities of the time, did the press owners take the opportunity to print only works which were associated with the new social awakening? This may be a plausible reason for the meagreness in the number of new poems written in Sinhalese during this six years.

Was there also a reaction against the new poetical tradition of this time by the traditional scholars produced during the previous quarter of a century by the two great monastic colleges? Those who had had scholarly training in Sanskrit, Pali and latterly in Sinhalese, might have preferred a poetical tradition along the lines of classical canons. The colloquial language and idiom, the unscientific system of metrics and the prohibited or previously unexplored subject matter employed by these poets in these new poetical works must have been irritating to scholars who had

85. Albert De Silva, Surāsoṇḍa Caritaya, 1904, verse 43.

been given a systematic discipline under the great scholars of that time, who believed in Elu as the language of poetry, in 'Elu Saṇḍās Lakuna' and other classical works for the traditionally accepted metres, and in 'Siyabas Lakara' and classical poetry for the limited field of subject matter. This argument can be supported by the appearance of a considerable number of classical poems during this period edited by the scholars produced by these two great institutions. Six classical poems earlier than the seventeenth century, namely 'Muvadev Dā' and 'Mayura Sandēśa' (1880), 'Girā Sandēśa' (1883), 'Sāyul Sandēśa' (1889), 'Budugunālakāraya' (1894) and 'Kav Silumiṇa' (1899) had already been edited by these traditional scholars. Eight further classical poems were edited by these scholars during the six years after 1900. Did these scholars believe that the absence of an evaluative criticism on poetry was the main cause of the deterioration of Sinhalese poetry? And by a dissemination of knowledge on classical standards through these editions were they preparing the ground to counteract the new poetical tradition in Sinhalese? This certainly seems to be an interesting question.

CONCLUSION

With the dominance of the new lay leadership in the Sinhalese society by the twentieth century, the religious zeal which gave birth to most of the activities in social and literary fields was lost. Lankābhinava Viśr̥ta Press, one of the first Sinhalese Buddhist presses, hitherto understood to be a common property of the Buddhist public, was given as a hereditary property to Robert Baṭuvantuḍāvē by Baṭuvantuḍāvē Pandit, the father of Robert, and he used it as a printing press to print books and newspapers which would collect him money. Some other presses which were established at temple premises to print books and periodicals during the religious struggle, were at that time claimed as their personal belongings by the priests of the temples, and this situation was ridiculed by the editor of Kavaṭa Katikayā, saying that the modern bhikkhus were preaching a new Precept, that is 'by giving a printing press to a temple he will collect four bushels of merits' (accu yantara-dānena catur-busalam puññaṃ labbhati). This was the prevailing situation just after the period discussed in this thesis.

The new poetical tradition which we discussed in the preceding pages, as I have suggested at the end, met with a challenge extended by the sophisticated traditional

scholars, produced by the two great seats of learning at Māligākanda and Pāliyaḡoḡa, and their affiliated branches throughout the Island. The poetical works that appeared in the first few years of the twentieth century were less in number, when compared to the sudden growth in plenty during the last part of the nineteenth century. As we have noted earlier religious and contemporary social events were neglected by the turn of the 20th century and all the poets diverted their energy and creative talents to develop a very limited field of subject matter; that is Temperance. At the beginning of the second decade of this century the Temperance movement was taken over grabbed by the self-motivated new lay leaders as a means of influencing Sinhalese society, to fulfil their ambitions. At this juncture most of the poets who had enriched the new poetical tradition and who were not genuinely influenced by this superficial Temperance movement seem to have given up writing Sinhalese poetry. We do not come across any evidence that these new lay leaders sought for the help of the Sinhalese poets in their ventures.

Hikkaḡuvē Sumangala nāyaka thera, the principal of Vidyodaya Pirivena, also played a part in the new Temperance movement launched by the lay leaders.

Therefore the new poetry could have been widely used as a very strong and impressive method of arousing the feelings of an audience against the use of intoxicants. If the campaign against liquor of P.A.Silva of Baṇḍaravatta had survived at that time, he would have used the creations of the Sinhalese poets of this new tradition in support of his movement. But most of the leaders of the new Temperance movement were unacquainted with Sinhalese poetry and the few priests who had been used by the new lay leaders had ignored Sinhalese poetry. While the new Temperance movement led by the hypocritic new lay leaders, some of whom were themselves farming the Arrack trade, drew the popular support of the unthinking ordinary mass, Sinhalese poetry suffered.

On the otherhand the scholars produced by the Vidyodaya and Vidyāḷankāra Pirivenas continued the paraphrasing and editing of the classical works in a scholarly way, linking the traditional system with the modern pirivena education. D.H.S.Abhayaratna and M.P. Wickramasinha edited 'Kusa Jātakaya' and 'Muvadev Dā' respectively in 1909. Vāḷipaṭṭanvila Dīpankara of Tangalle paraphrased 'Mayura Sandēśaya' in 1910, and P.F.Abhayawickrama and Haltota Jinānanda edited 'Gangārōhaṇa Varṇanāva' and 'Tisara Sandēśaya' in 1911.

And the competition between these two traditional seats also became obvious in the Sinhalese literary field. Ratmalānē Dharmārāma of Vidyālankāra Pirivena paraphrased and edited 'Kāvya Śēkharaya' in 1915 which had undergone a similar edition in 1887 at the hands of Baṭuvantuḍāvē Pandit and Hikkaḍuvē Sumangala of Vidyodaya Pirivena. 'Budugunāḷankāraya', which had been edited in 1894 by D.B.Jayatilaka who had connections with Vidyālankāra Pirivena, again met with the critical evaluation of Valānē Dhammānanda of Vidyodaya Pirivena, and he printed his version in 1923.

Ratmalānē Dharmārāma's article on the usage of the Buddhist era, which appeared in Sarasavi Saṇḍarāsa on 22.11.1907, met with the criticisms of Mahagoḍa Gñānissara, the deputy principal of Vidyodaya Pirivena, in 'Sihala Samaya' newspaper, and this controversy was arbitrated by the mahānāyaka thera of Malvatta, on 18.9.1908.

Prācīna Bhāṣōpakāra Samāgama was established in 1902, under the sponsorship of the Director of Education, and this Society held three examinations and started to award the title 'Pandit' to those who were successful at the tend in 1910. These Pandits came from both Vidyodaya and Vidyālankāra Pirivenas. They decried the new poetical tradition and its creations like

'Sulaṁbāvatī Katāva', 'Pattini Hālla', 'Ranahansa Mālaya' and 'Pāduru Mālaya', and sometimes ridiculed the poets as cheats who only wheedle money from their readers. Meanwhile these scholars were trying to supply Sinhalese poetry with a firm and sound foundation by compiling books on the elements of Sinhalese poetry. Tomas Karunāratna and Valānē Dhammānanda, both attached to the Vidyodaya Pirivena, wrote two such compilations entitled 'Sinhala Dhātu Ratanāvaliya' and 'Helu Dā Ruvanakara' respectively on the subject of roots, which is the basic material a poet had to use in the Sinhalese language.

In face of this traditional scholarly force exerted by Vidyodaya and Vidyālankāra Pirivenas, the new poetical tradition was declining, and it had to face another serious enemy with the appearance of Munidāsa Kumāratunga and his new school in the third decade of this century. He had edited a series of classical poetical works, which were mostly prescribed texts for the government examinations. He injected a new spirit into the study of Sinhalese poetry and ignored the creations of the past century by the new unsophisticated poets who had enriched the new poetical

tradition which we discussed. Thus we can note that 1852-1906, the period under discussion in this thesis, witnessed the birth of the new poetic tradition in Sinhalese and its development, through religious activities of the Island, but that after the first decade of the twentieth century it declined in the face of new social forces.

Bibliography

(Unless otherwise stated all the following books were
published in Colombo.)

Printed Books

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Abhayaratna, D.H.S. | -Bāḍovrā Katāva, (1896). |
| Abhayavikrama, M. | -Ovā Mutuhara, (1893). |
| Abraham | -Selestinā Katāva, (3rd edition),
(1887).
-(4th edition), (1896). |
| Abrew, C. | -Sītāmbarapaṭaya, (1866).
-Tirihan Polla, (1867).
-Veda Ure, (1867). |
| Adiriyan Appuhāmy, H.L. | -Dussīla Mardanaya, (1895). |
| Agaḥavatte Nākāttā | -Kusa-rāja Mangallaya, (1894). |
| Aggarval, H.N. | -Reminiscences of Colonel Olcott,
(Madras), 1932. |
| Agha Hasan, (Amanath). | -Inder Sabha, (Hindustani),
(Cawnpore, 1853).
-Inder Sabha, (Hindi), (Delhi, 1876).
-Inder Sabha, (Hindi), (Delhi, 1877).
-Indar Sabhā, (Sinhalese), (1893). |
| A.J. | -Āyāsōka Mālaya, (1893). |
| Alwis, C. (translator) | -Nāmāvaliya, (1858). |

- Alagaiyavanna -Kusa Jātaka Mahā Kāvya, edited by Kosgoḍa Paññāsāra, (1868).
 -Kusa Jātakaya, edited by D.H.S. Abhayaratna, (1909).
 -Subhāṣitaya, edited by R.W.Dias, (3rd edition), (1869).
- Amarasiha, B. (editor) -Śabda Binduva, (Vālitōṭa), 1888).
 -Kaccāyana Sāraya, (Vālitōṭa), 1892).
- Amarasinha, C.P. (editor) -Vaḍuga Haṭṭanaya, (1890).
- Amarasinha, J.A. (editor) -Sidat Saṅgarāvē Antyārdhaya, (Vālitōṭa), (1892).
- Ambagolē -Bōmāḍa Alamkāraya Saha Himāla Vistaraya, (Kandy), (1887).
- anonymous -Kovul Saka (1867).
 -Hasun Kav Mālāva, (1867).
 -Sipiri Mālāya, (1888).
 -Sipiri Mālāya, (Mātara), (1888).
- Appuhāmy, D.A.V. (editor) -Vadan Kavi Pota Saha Buddha Gajjaya, (1868).
- Armour, J. -Nīti Nighanḍuva, (1861).
- Armour, J. -A Grammar of the Kandyan Law, (1880).
- Arnolis, M.H. -Buduguna Viriduva, (1895).
- Arnolis, P. Don. -Itihāsa Khandanaya, (1876).
 -Buddhabana Pratyakṣa Vāda Mūlōcchēdaniya, Part 1, (1896).

- Attygala, S. -Siri Dampal Vata, (1965).
- Āyittaliyadde -Sangarāja Sādhu Cariyāva, edited
by P.B.Sannasgala and N.Paññāsena,
(1947).
- Balangoda Guru -Samanala Vistaraya, (1897).
- Barnabas, W.D. -D.J.B.Callet Stuti Patra, (1889).
- Bastian, C. Don. -Ovā Mutuhara, (1889).
- Rāvana Samhāraya, (1886).
- Akṣara Śikṣāva, (1887).
- Kav Mini Barana, (1891).
- Kalana Mitu Ruvana, (1889).
- Baṭuvantūḍāvē, D.A.De.S. -Śataślōkaya, (1862).
- (editor) -Vyāsakāraya, (1866).
- Bhakti Śatakaya, (1868).
- Vṛtta Mālā Vyākhyāva, (1867).
- Anuruddha Śatakaya, (1866).
- Guptila Kāvya, (1870).
- Guptila Kāvya, (1886).
- Kaccāyana Dhātu Manjusā, (1872).
- Lōkōpakāraya, (1872).
- Sidat, Saṅgarāvē Purāna Sannaya,
(1877).
- Nāma Lingānusāsanaya, (1880).
- Sūrya Śatakaya, (1883).
- Kāvya Śekhara, (1887).

- Yōga Śatakaya, (1886).
- Bālāvatāra Sannaya, (1885).
- Okonḍapola Sannaya, (1888).
- Mahāvamsaya, (1887).
- Ruvan Mala, (1892).
- Piyum Mala, (1892).
- Besant Annie.
 - Popular Lectures in Ceylon, (Madras) (1908).
 - Annie Besant in Ceylon, (Madras), (1893).
- Bonjean, E.C.
 - Jācobayit Vēda Bhēdayē Anuśāsanā Patraya, (1889).
- Buddhadatta, A.P.
 - Samīpātītayehi Baudhācāryayō, (Ambalangoḍa), (1956).
 - Kalyāṇivamsika Mahā Nikāya, (3 parts), (1918-1919).
 - Thēravādi Baudhācāryayō, (1960).
 - Pāli Sandesāvalī, (Ambalangoḍa), (1962).
 - Pāli Sāhitya, (Ambalangoḍa), (1962).
- Cabral, P.L.
 - Kav Mini Dama, (1892).
 - Kurulu Katāva, (1893).
- Capper, J.
 - A Full Account of the Buddhist Controversy, (1873).
 - The Duke of Edinburgh in Ceylon, (1871), London.
- C.R.T.S.
 - A Collection of Hymns, (1885).

D'Alwis, J.

-Sīdat Saṅgarāva, (1851).

-Sīdat Saṅgarāva, (1852).

-Asvārōhanaya, (1869).

-A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit,
Pali and Sinhalese Literary Works
of Ceylon, Vol. 1, (1870).

-Contributions to Oriental
Literature, Part 1, (1863).

Dally, J.B.

-Report of the Galle Convention,
(Galle), (1891).

Dandīn

-Siyabas Lakara, (1892).

De Alwis, Jas.

-Niruttara Prasāna Khandanayaṭa
Pilituru, (1891).

-Bauddha Kathopakathana Parīkṣanaya,
(1897).

De Lanerolle, V.D.

-Hapankam Mōḍakam Saha Purasāram,
(1959).

De Pinto, I.

-Strī Gunālamkāraya, (1888).

De Saram,

-Gītikā Pota, (1755).

De Saram, D.

-Mahā Kaṇha Jātakaya, (1870).

De Silva, A.

-Pandukeliya, (1888).

-Volanteer Kaṇḍavura, (Doḍandūva),
(1890).

-Bentoṭa Lakara, (Doḍandūva), (1890).

-Vesak Kav Maldama, (1893).

-Surāsoṇḍa Caritaya, (1904).

- De Silva, A. (editor) -Nīlakobō Sandēśaya, (1896).
 -Maha Haṭṭana, (1896).
 -Maha Sohon Samayama, (1892).
 -Sinnamuttu Katāva, (1892).
 -Surāsonḍa Sandēśaya, (1893).
- De Silva, Allis -Sakvala Vistaraya, (Galle, 1885).
- De Silva, B. -Avurudu Mālaya, (Galle, 1891).
 -Viridu Mālaya, (Galle, 1891).
- De Silva, C.W. -Sōka Vivaranaya, (1891).
- De Silva, D.M. -Kāvyavatāmsaya, (1907).
 -Ṣaḍvarna Kāvya, (1907).
 -Jinarājāṣṭakaya, (1908).
- De Silva, J. (editor) -Saṅgaraja Vata, (1867).
- De Silva, J. -Alakēśvara Caritaya, (1915).
 -Uttara Rāma Caritaya, (1906).
 -Sirisaṅgabō Nāṭakaya, (1903).
- De Silva, K.H.M. -Simhala Sāhāli, (1957).
 -Simhala Navakatāvē Purōgāmiyā, (1966).
- De Silva, K. -The Life of Mīripānnē Dhammaratana, (Galle, 1868).
- De Silva, S. -Gam Vatura, (1872).
- De Silva, S. -Kumārōdaya Varṇanāva, (1876).
- De Soysa, J.M.C -Gaja Sival Katāva, (1889)
- De Soysa, M.F.M. -Muva Kavudu Sival Katāva, (1899).
- De Soysa, N. -Māra Yuddhaya, (1868).

- De Zoysa, L. - Catalogue of Pali and Sinhalese Books, (1876).
- Dhammajoti, S. -Bālāvatāra Sannaya, (1913).
- Dharmarama, R. (editor) -Sidat Saṅgarāva, (1902).
- Dharmarama, R. and R. Dhammaloka -Samskr̥ta Śabda Mālāva, (1876).
- Dharmarama, R. (editor) -Jānakīharana, (1891).
- Dharmaratne, G. A. -Kara-Goi Contest, (1891).
- Dias, H. -Apē Paṇḍivaru, (1896).
- Disanayaka, K. -Kalla Mālaya, (Galle, 1885).
- Disanayaka, D. L. -Samanala Gamana, (1884).
- Disanayaka, T. S. -Gangārōhana Varṇanāva, edited by P. F. Abhayavikrama, (1911).
- Fernando, C. W. -Vaiśāka Mangalya Varṇanāva, (Pāliyaḡoḡa, 1888).
- Fernando, D. K. -Kovul Māḡi Targaya, (1894).
- Fernando, E. A. -Mīthyā Dr̥ṣṭhi Vinīśaya, (1890).
- Fernando, H. D. -Lakunu Sara, (1899).
- Fernando, H. J. A. -Kālidas Caritaya, (1887).
- Fernando, J. A. -Latōni Pota, (1887).
- Fernando, S. S. -Kumāra Sandēśaya, (1909).
- Fonseka, D. K. -Mahavila Āvaritanne Pinkam Varṇanāva, (1893).
- Pin Kiriya Vata, (1891).

- Gogerly, D.J. -Kristiāni Pragñaptiya, (1885).
- Gonsalves, J. -Duk Prāpti Prasangaya, (1891).
-Milavi Pasaṇ, (1868).
-Pasaṇ Pota, (1868).
- Gunananda, M. -Dussila Dāna Vinīścaya, (1887).
-Gampola Vādaya, (1871).
-Udanviṭṭa Vāda Katāva Gānaya, (1866).
-Bauddha Praśnaya, (1887).
(editor) -Milinda Praśnaya, (1878).
- Gunaratna, A.W. -Kav Mini Dapana, (Mātara, 1894).
- Gunaratna, B. -Nimi Jātaka Kāvya, (1887).
- Gunaratnayaka, D.D. -Visama Taruni, (1867).
- Gunaratna, D.H. -Kōla Vidhiya, (1866).
- Gunaratna, J.M.P. -Bhāminī Carita Darpanaya, (1887).
- Gunasekara, H.M. -Catalogue of Pali and Sinhalese Books, (1901).
- Gunavardhana, P. -Mōkṣa Dānaya Hevat Nivan Soyā Dīma, (1893).
- Gunavardhana, W.F. (editor) -Nikāya Sangrahaya, (1907).
-Guttila Kāvya Varṇanā, (1916).
- Gurulugomi -Dharma Pradīpikāva, edited by
R.Dhammaloka and R.Dharmarama,
(1886).
-(second edition, (1906).

- Hasan -Karunā Guru Pavaruva, (1893).
- Hevavitarana, C.A. -Vidyodaya, (1926-1930).
- Hevavitarana, D. -Decennial Report of the B.T.S., (1890).
-Daṁbadiya Jayamaha Bōdhī Vahansē, (1895).
- Hulugalle, H.A.J -D.R.Vijayavardhana Caritaya, (1962).
- Hunupola, J.E. -Udanviṭṭa Vāda Katāva Gānaya, (1866).
- Idirisinha, A.P. -Ariṣṭadāvaliya, (1892).
-Rahat Caritaya, (1892).
- Janananda, M. -Buddha Ādahilla, (2nd edition), (1894).
- Jayasuriya, D.M. -Niruttara Prasānaya, (1891).
-Niruttara Prasāna Khaṇḍanaya, (1892).
- Jayasuriya, H.P. -Savsaddam Vādaya, (1873).
- Jayatilaka, H. (editor) -Elu Akārādiya, (1893).
-Girā Sandēśaya, (1883).
-Amā Vatura, (1885).
-Nāmāvaliya, (1888).
-Sālalinī Sandēśaya, (1892).
-Siyabas Lakara, (1892).
- Jayavikrama, D.A. -Sāma Jātakayē Viridu Pota, (Galle, 1885).
- Jinadasa, J.P.D. -Srimat Jayatilaka Caritaya, (1946).
- Jinarajadasa, C. -The Golden Book of the Theosophical Society, (Madras, 1925).
- Joseph, G.A. -Catalogue of the Colombo Museum Library (Printed Books), (1904).
-The Catalogue of the Colombo Museum Library (Manuscripts), (1904).

- Joseph, G.A. -Catalogue of Pali, Sinhalese and
Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Colombo
Museum Library, (1901).
- Kalidasa -Śrītabōdhaya, edited by V.Dhammaratana,
(1888).
- Kalinga -Caturvarna Vibhāvaniya, (1885).
- Kaluaracci, A.W. -Śrīmat Anagārika Dharmapāla Caritaya,
(1958).
- Kannangara, A.S. -Anurādhapura Alamkāraya, (Kandy, 1887).
- Karolis Appu -Dēva Māṇiyan Kiyā Āṇḍū Vilāpa Latōni,
(1893).
- Gāyanālamkāraya, (1892).
- Kupāḍi Maṭṭanaya, (1892).
- Karunaratna, D. -Śrīmat Anagārika Dharmapāla Caritaya,
(1944).
- Karunaratna, D.A. -Mātanga Jātakaya, (1894).
- Kedarabhatta -Vṛtta Ratnākaraya, edited by A.De.A.
Vijayasinha, (1889).
- Kivisuru -Mayura Sandēśaya, edited by V.Dīpankara,
(1910), 2nd edition, (1923).
- Kumaradasa -Jānakīharaṇa, edited by R.Dharmārāma,
(1891).
- Jānakīharaṇa, edited by J.S.Rājasundara,
(1890), 2nd edition, (1904).
- Jānakīharaṇa, edited by S.Paranavitana
and C.E.Godakumbure, (1967) and (1969).

Kure, W.V.D

Kurukularatna, A.D.A

Lanerolle, J.

Malalasekera, G.P.

Maniratana, S.

Munkotuve Abesinha

Murdoch, J.

& J. Nicholson

Nāgasinha, D.B.

Nandāramatissa, Y.

Nandārāma, V.

Olcott, H.S.

-Kav Mini Sayura, (1890).

-Adāniyel Pralāpa Katura,
(Mātara, 1895).

-C.A. Hēvāvitāraṇa Caritaya, (1930).

-Pali Literature of Ceylon,
(London, 1928).

-Vamsatthappakāsini, (Oxford, 1935).

-Prātihārya Śatakaya, edited by
D.P.De.S. Āpā Appuhāmy, (1864).

-Saṅgaraja Vata, (1867).

-The Theosophy Unveiled,
(Madras, 1885).

-The Theosophic Craze, (Madras,
1894).

-Theosophy Exposed, (Madras, 1893).

-The Classified Catalogue of
Printed Tracts and Books in
Singhalese, (Madras, 1868).

-Āśirvāda Kāvya, (Galle, 1892).

-Abhidharmārtha Sangrahaya, (1891).

-Karatōṭa Vata, (Mātara, 1940).

-The Theosophical Society,
(Bombay, 1879).

-The Life of Buddha and its
Lessons, (1880).

-Bauddha Katōpakathanaya, (1881).

-A Buddhist Catechism, (1882).

Olcott, H.S.

- Common Foundation of All Religions,
(Adyar, 1913).

-Historical Retrospect, (1896). (Madras).

-Old Diary Leaves, First Series, (1895).

-Old Diary Leaves, Second Series, (1878-
1883), (London, 1900).

-Old Diary Leaves, (Third Series, (1883-
1887), (London, 1914).

-Old Diary Leaves, (Fourth Series), (1887-
1892), 2nd edition, (Madras, 1931).

-Old Diary Leaves, (Fifth Series), (1893
April, 1896), (Madras, 1932).

-Old Diary Leaves, (Sixth Series), (April
1896- September 1898), (Madras, 1935).

Pandita Gunavardhana-Pransa Nr̥tya Kāvya, (1867).

Patmaperuma,

-Bramford Kāvya, (1891).

-Vijaya Kumara Vata, (1892).

Pattāyamē Lēkham

-Ādara Sōka Mālaya Saha Ratavatī
Katāva, (1868).

Pedro, G.D.

-Bhayamkāra Vedilla, (1907).

Perera, A & De Saram

-Sinhala Bāsāvē Gītikā Pota, (1755).

Perera, C.

-Kaṭugampola Haṭṭanaya, (1892).

Perera, C.A.W

-Sidat Saṅgarāvē 11-12 Pariccheda (Galle,
1891).

Perera, D.

-Jātivāda Mardanaya, (1885).

Perera, D.C

-Jātaivāda Mardana Varnanā(1885).

Perera, F.J.

-Siddhārtha Kumārōdaya Varnanāva,
(1888).

Pereira, J.

-Heladiv Radaniya,(1853).
-2nd edition,(1868).

Perera, J.B.

-Nīti Ratnāvali,(Dehivala,1911).
-2nd edition,(Dehivala,1914).

Perera, J.B.G.

-Culla Paduma Jātaka Kāvya,(1893).

Perera, K.A.D.

-Māyam Peraliya,(1893).

Perera, K.L.

-Simhala Daru Nālavilla,(1892).

Perera, K.R.

-Īśvara Dāhānaya,(1893).
-Abhinava Kusa Jātaka Kāvya,(1886).
-Alav Katāva,(1888).
-Ānanda Bōdhi Jātakaya,(1889).
-2nd edition,(1910).
-Attanagalu Upata,(1897).
-Duliyānu Katāva,(1895).
-Buduguna Saṅgarāva,(1894).
-Daladā Vistaraya,(1892).
-Dēva Dūtē,(1889).
-Dharmāsōka Vata,(1893).
-Duṭṭugāmunu Vata,(1891).
-Gunanaṇḍana Vata,(1890).
-Kalpōtpatti Mālaya,(1889).
-Mahā Silava Jātakaya,(1890).

Perera, K.R.

- Mārga Vistaraya, (1891).
- Nāgasēna Miliṇḍu Katāva, (1890).
- Perahāra Alamkāraya, (1892).
- Rāvana Yuddhaya, (1893).
- Ruvanwāli Vistaraya, (1892).
- Siddhārtha Kumāra Caritaya, (1892).
- Sāma Jātakaya, (1893).
- Samanala Gamana, (1890).
- Simhala Rāja Malava, (1888).
- Sūdu Haṭṭanaya, (1893).
- Suvarna Mayura Jātakaya, (1892).
- Tarka Jātaka Kāvya, (1886).
- Tunruvan Vandanāva, (1890).
- Ummagga Jātaka Kāvya, (1889).
- Vessantara Viriduva, (1892).

Perera, M.C.

- Yasōdarā Dēvi Katāva, (1889).

Perera, M.C.F.

- Madyapāna Vilāpaya, (1904).

Perera, M.H.A.

- Koloṃba Vistaraya, (1896).

Perera, N.M.

- Rāga Māsivilla, (1889).

Pieris, P.A.

- Niruttara Praśnaya, (1891).
- Vinaya Apatīcchanna Bhāva Viniścaya, (1892).

- Pānadurē Abhinava Vāda Pota, (1892).

Pillippu Siṅṅo

- Āhālēpola Nāḍagama, (1870).
- Sulāmbāvatī Nāḍagama, (1874).

- Pragñāsēkhara, K. -Sinhala Puvatpat Saṅgarā Itihāsayā,
 -Vol.1,(1965).
 -Vol.2,(1966).
 -Vol.3,(1967).
 -Vol.4,(1968).
 -Svayamlikhita Śrī Pragñāsēkhara
 Caritāpadānaya,(1970).
- Ramacandra, P. -Śrī Dharmārāma Caritaya,(1913).
- Ranasgalle -Lōkōpakāraya,edited by M.Gunaratna,
 (1872).
- Ranasinha, W.F. -Gahapati Vinīścaya,(1897).
 -Ummagga Jātakaya,(1875).
- Rahula -Kāvya Śēkharaya,edited by H.Sumangala
 (1872).
 -edited by R.Dharmārāma,(1915).
- Ratanapala, M. -Heladiv Abidānavata,(1892).
- Ratnaika, L.D.A. -John De Silva Nāṭaka Itihāsayā,(1964)
 S.E. -Marakkala Haṭṭanaya,(1891).
- Samararatna, K. -Sarasavi Nighandūva,(1865).
- Samarasekara, W.H.De.S. -Abhinavārāma Varnanāva,(1894).
- Sangharakkhita, G. -Teruvan Mālā (1965).
- Sangharakkhita -Vuttodaya,(1877).
 -2nd edition, (1888).
- Sannasgala, P.B. -Simhala Sāhitya Vamsāyā,(1961).
- Seneviratna, A.C. -Memorials and Desultory Writings
 of James D'Alwis,(1939).

Seneviratna, G.	-Apē Paṇḍivaru (1965).
Silva K.	-Aṅgaṇa Guna Dapana, (1894).
Sinhaba,	-Jana Vamsaya, (1864).
Simon, W.D.	-Sapta Svāra Saṅgarāva, (1892).
Siri Saddhammavamsa, K.	-Siri Am̐bagahavattē Indāsabha Varagñāna Mahānāyaka Caritaya, (1950)
Sirisumana, R.	-Abhayatissa Nāyaka Caritaya, (1909).
Sirisumitta, M.	-Kavmini Randama, (1892).
Sirivardhana, P.S.	-Kusa Nāḍagama, (1869).
Somadasa, K.D.	-Lankāvē Puskola Pot Nāmāvaliya, (1969).
Soysa,	-Jātivāda Mardanaya, (1885).
Sumangala, H.	-Pāli Nāma Varanāgilla, (1873). -Mahāvamsa, (1883). -Māsartu Lakṣanaya, (1874).
Sumangala, V.	-Itihāsaya, (1876).
Sunanda, M.	-Rūpa Mālāva, (1873).
Talgodapitiya, W.	-Portraits of Ten Patriots of Ceylon, (1966).
Ubhayasekara, J.O.M.	-The Origin of Govigama, (1909).
Upatapassi	-Vutta Mālā, (1871).
Uttarananda, I.	-Vyavasthā Sangrahaya, (Śrī Lankā Rāmañña Nikāya,), (Induruva, 1950).

- Vaidyanatha, H. De. A. R. -Vesaturu Nāḍagama, (1873).
- Vanigasekara -Itihāsa Mūlōcchēdanaya, (1885).
- Vickramasinha, K. D. P. -Nūtana Simhala Sāhitya, (1965).
- Vidagama, -Budugunālamkāraya, edited by D. B. Jayatilaka, (1894).
- edited by V. Dhammānanda, (1923).
- Lōvāḍa Saṅgarāva, (1866).
- Kāvya Lakṣaṇa Mani Mālā, (1953).
- Vijayasekara, -Licchavi Katāva, (1889).
- Vilgammula -Saṇḍakiṇḍuru Jātaka Kāvya, edited by V. Dhammānanda, (1931).
- Virasuriya, P. D. S. -Simhala Kavīndrayō, (1934-1937).
- Woodhouse, W. G. -Sissiyanusissia Paramparava and Other Laws Relating to Buddhist Priests in Ceylon, (Tellippallai, 1906).
- Wright, A. -Twentieth Century Impressions on Ceylon, (1908). (London).
- W. W. -A Review of Nīti Nighaṇḍuva, (1885).
- W. W. -Caturvarṇaya, (1886).

ii. Printed Tracts

- Why Does Not the God Kill the Devil? (1888).
- The Idea of an Immortal Soul is Irrational, (1889).
- Māvunkārayek Nāti Bava, (1887).
- Satya Gavēśanaya, (1887).

Kristus Gālavumkārayekda? (1887).

Yehovah Siyalla Dānagat Kenekda?(1887).

Can There be Eternal Happiness or Sorrow?(1889).

The God and the Devil of Orthodoxy,(1888).

✓ Satya Viniścaya,(1867).

— Satya Dvajaya,(1862).

— Satyārtha Prakāśaya,(1862).

— Bauddha Labdhi Parīkṣā,(1862).

— Buddhabana Pratyakṣaya,(1867).

Amadhyapāna Vākya Sangrahaya,(1891).

How Can Sins be Forgiven?(1889).

Abhayanaikē,J. —Drṣṭhi Darpanaya,(Galle,1890).

Cord,B. —Jesus Christ,(1889).

— De Silva,KP. —Durlabdhī Vinōdanī,(1862).

De Silva,S. —Bauddha Prakāśaya,(Vālitōṭa,1889).

—Bauddha Mārgaya,(Vālitōṭa,1891).

✓ Gunānanda,M. —Kristiāni Vāda Mardanaya,(1862).

—Saddharma Sangrahaya,(1867).

—Satya Mārgaya,(1867).

✓ Sumangala,H. —Sudarsānaya,(1862).

—Sumati Sangrahaya,(Galle,1864).

Todd,J. —Bāla Dharma Granthaya,(1891).

✓ Vijayasinha,D.P. —Vibhajja Vādaya,(Kāgalle,1872).

Newspapers

Dinakara Prakāśaya, (1887-1891).

Lakminipahana, (1862).

Lakrivikirana, (1862).

Rivirāsa, (1888).

Sarasavi Saṅdarāsa, (1880-1906).

Satyālankāraya, (1873-1881).

Sinhala Bauddhayā, (1906).

Sinhala Jātiya, (1903).

Periodicals

Arut Saṅgarāva, edited by R.Dhammāloka, (June 1873).

The Aryan, edited by A.E.Roberts Ratnavira, (1909).

The Buddhist, edited by C.W.Leadbeater, A.E.Buultjens,

L.C.Wijesinha and D.C.Pedris, (1888-1904).

Gñānopāyini, edited by P.A.Pieris, (1873).

MahāBōdhi Saṅgarāva, edited by Valisinha Hariscandra, (1902).

Samaya Sangrahava, edited by H.Sumangala, (1873).

Sārārtha Pradīpikā, edited by Baṭuvantudāvē Pandit, (1864).

Śāstrālankāraya, edited by M.J.Perira, (1853).

Satya Samuccaya, edited by R.Dharmārāma, (1873).

Silumina, edited by W.F.Gunavardhana, (1907-1909).

The Theosophist, edited by H.P.Blavatsky, (Bombay, 1879-1889).

Viduliya, edited by W.A.Samarasekara, (1907).

Yatalaba Saṅgarāva, edited by Baṭuvantudāvē Pandit, (1854).

ManuscriptsLondoni. British Museum

Alav Yakāge Kavi	-OR 6615(33).
Atula Rāja Katāva	-OR 6611(44).
Bōmāṇḍa Alamkāraya	-OR 6603(132), OR 6604(157).
Danta Dhātu Aṭṭhakas	-OR 6601(98), OR 6601(11), OR 6601(203), OR 6611(197).
Devadūta Sutrāya	-OR 6599(24).
Katikāvata of Mādagama	-OR 6603(254).
Kālani Sāhalla	-OR 6611(91).
Kovul Saka	-OR 6611(130).
Kula Nītiya	-OR 6606(49), OR 6606(55).
Mahākanha Jātaka Kavi	-OR 6604(17), OR 6604(91).
Mahā Pataranga Jātakaya	-OR 6611(2).
Makhādeva Jātaka Kavi	-OR 6604(224), OR 6604(225).
Mihiripānnē Dharmaratna	-OR 6611(248).
Muva Jātaka Kavi	-OR 6604(88), OR 6604(89), OR 6604(144).
Nimi Jātaka Kavi	-OR 6604(145), OR 6604(51).
Padamānavaka Jātaka	-OR 6603(111), OR 6604(98).
Pirininvan Jātaka Kavi	-OR 6604(99), OR 6604(95).
Sakvala Vistaraya	-OR 6604(103), OR 6604(212), OR 6604(226).
Samanala Halla	-OR 6604(190), OR 6604(197).

Sīmā Samkara Vinodini,	-OR 6603(216), OR 6603(232).
Simhavalli Katāva	-OR 6611(78), OR 6611(204).
Sokari Katāva	-OR 6611(6), OR 6611(198).
Solos Svapnaya	-OR 6604(212), OR 6611(61), OR 6611(103), OR 6613(64), OR 6613(68).
Svapnamālaya	-OR 6613(60), OR 6613(61), OR 6613(67).
Vidhura Jātaka Kavi	-OR 6604(13), OR 6604(141), OR 6604(142), OR 7657), OR 6615(10), OR 6604(126), OR 6604(50), OR 6604(31).
Vitti Paṭuna	-OR 6605(16).
Yasōdarā Vata	-OR 6604(130).

Methodist Mission Society

Correspondence (1818- 1881).

Ceylon

Bentara Vanavāsa Vihāraya, Bentota.

Puṣpārāmaya, Vālitara.

Śailabimbārāmaya, Doḍandūva.

Śrī Pāda Caityārāmaya, Ganegama, Baddegama.

Śrī Praṇāsēkhara Library, Navagamuva.

Vālukārāmaya, Dadalla, Galle.

Personal Discussions

Ahungallē Vimalikittitissa nāyaka sthavira, Puṣpārāmaya,
Vālitara.

Colombatantri, H.S.P. , London.

Disanayaka, Piyasena, London.

Doḍandūvē Dharmasena sthavira, Śailabimbārāmaya, Doḍandūva

Horana Vajiragñāna sthavira, Vidyāratna Pirivena, Horana.

Induruvē Uttarānanda nāyaka sthavira, Induruva.

Kalukoṇḍayāvē Paññāsekara nāyaka sthavira, Māligākanda.

Kaṃburupiṭṭiyē Vanaratana nāyaka sthavira, Mātara.

Karunaratna, D. 'Davasa' Colombo.

Labugama Lankānanda nāyaka sthavira, Molligoḍa.

Mātalē Sāsanatilaka nāyaka sthavira, Colombo.

Mullapiṭṭiyē K.H.De Silva Vijayaśrīvardhana rālahāmy,

Alut Māvata Valavva, Colombo.

Pieris, J, London.

Pieris, V. London.

Wijayavardhana, C. Colombo.